

PRINTING OF DATA ON WORK OF THE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD certain data with respect to the work of the session.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not want to object if I may have a better understanding with the able leader of the majority as to the nature of the request. Sometimes there have been inserted in the RECORD immaterial and incompetent matters which I do not think add anything to the standing of the RECORD. Will the Senator be specific as to the nature of the material?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have asked the Secretary of the Senate to prepare for me certain statistics and material with respect to the work of the session. Also, in all likelihood there may be a memorandum from the State Department with respect to certain aspects of legislation. That is all I have in mind.

Mr. McNARY. With the understanding, Mr. President, that the matter inserted in the RECORD shall be limited to the statement made just now by our leader as to the material he is having prepared, and, in addition, the statement from the Secretary of State, I have no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know of anything else, and if the Senator objects to anything else I would not include it.

Mr. McNARY. I should object to anything other than stated by the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is all I ask.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think everything has been accomplished that has to be accomplished at this session, and all formalities have been attended to.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Has the Vice President signed the joint resolution?

Mr. BARKLEY. He has. Therefore, pursuant to the concurrent resolution heretofore adopted, I move that the Senate do now adjourn sine die.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned sine die.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God of hosts, Thou who art the inspiration of our longings, help us to surrender to Thy outstretched arms of pitying mercy and whitening grace. Thou who dost impart to blind mortal eyes that loveliness which is immortal, O fill us with the spirit of truth that Thy thoughts may be our thoughts; that Thy ways may be our ways; and Thy works may be our works. We thank Thee that no smile of hope, no tear of sympathy, and no sacrificial task can be lost. We pray Thee that our labors may be a potent factor in this turbulent earth in setting in motion those deepening currents which shall melt storms into peace and mend the aching heart of the world. We rejoice, dear Lord, to know that home is the rainbow isle in the river of time whose compulsions are fed from the eternal spring of the human heart. Oh, may no plague come nigh our dwellings. Let a rich, divine blessing abide with our Speaker, the Members, the officers, and the employees of the Congress, and bring us together again without the loss of one. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 324

Resolved, That BUTLER B. HARE, of South Carolina, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Appropriations.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 325

Resolved, That FRANK B. KEEFE, of Wisconsin, be, and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

RECESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the remainder of the second session of the Seventy-sixth Congress it may be in order for the Speaker to recess the House at any time with the understanding that the bells will be rung 10 minutes before reassembly of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I say to the gentleman from Texas that I hope this session will be prolonged until January 1. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. What is the program for today?

Mr. RAYBURN. It is to wait on the action of the conferees and when the Senate acts, and it is probable that the Senate may act on the conference report today, we would like to have the House in session to receive the conference report.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I wonder if the gentleman from Texas is taking into consideration the fact that the House may not adjourn? Would he want that authority for too long a period of time under those circumstances?

Mr. RAYBURN. Oh, I would not want that authority longer than Monday or Tuesday of next week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Why not amend it by providing for 1 week?

Mr. RAYBURN. That is agreeable to me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the modified request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the leadership of the House if they will not give me and other Members of the House a hearing before the Rules Committee in order to discuss our remaining in continuous session? I introduced a resolution last spring for that purpose, and I have asked for hearings which have never been granted. I feel the country wants us here. It wanted us to remain in session last spring. There is much to consider besides neutrality or the lack of it which is important to our country.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, there is a complete reply to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. If the House is to remain in session, no one has to have a hearing before the Rules Committee and it is not necessary for the Rules Committee to report out a rule. When a sine die resolution is offered, all the Members of the House have to do is turn it down.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The Members would like to have a chance to discuss it.

Mr. RAYBURN. They will have all day today if they desire to do that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The motion is not debatable after it has been made.

Mr. RAYBURN. No; and it is not debatable before the Rules Committee unless the gentlewoman can get a hearing.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. All we want is a hearing.

Mr. RAYBURN. I cannot understand what the effect will be. The Rules Committee has never reported a rule in the history of the Congress directing when it shall adjourn or whether or not it shall adjourn.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. All I am asking for is a hearing. Why can we not make history by directing the Congress to stay in session?

Mr. RAYBURN. I may say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that I am not going to ask the Rules Committee to have a hearing on a resolution of that kind.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Then I make an appeal to the chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, the regular order.

Mr. RAYBURN. If a resolution of that kind is reported by the Rules Committee, I would resist it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the majority leader a question about giving the Speaker the power to recess the House at a time when the Federal Treasury shows that we have gone in the red to the extent of one and one-half billion dollars since July 1. Should we not stay here and find some means of getting money enough from the taxpayers of this country to pay the Government's bills?

The regular order was demanded.

Mr. RICH. Then I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania object?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask the majority leader a question.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, the rules of the House must be observed. I have submitted a unanimous-consent request, and the regular order has been demanded, so there is nothing for either the gentleman from Pennsylvania or me to say.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. Will it be possible for us to have an opportunity today to have the floor for 5 or 10 minutes?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will be delighted to recognize the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. Then I shall not object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection.

NEUTRALITY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

NOVEMBER 3, 1939.

The SPEAKER,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Pursuant to the special order agreed to on yesterday, the Clerk of the House received the following message from the Senate: "That the Senate insists upon its amendments disagreed to by the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306) entitled 'Neutrality Act of 1939'; agrees to the conference asked by the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and appoints Mr. PITTMAN, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. BORAH, and Mr. JOHNSON of California conferees on the part of the Senate."

Respectfully yours,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,

Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I only wanted to congratulate the majority on the very efficient manner in which they repealed the arms embargo and to call their attention to the fact that now that Britain and France can buy arms if they have the money, you should make some arrangements to sell some to the Navy so they can get through the picket lines at Detroit and retake their own property. [Applause.] I also want to call your attention to the cheering news that as long as John L. Lewis is levying an assessment of \$3,000,000 you had better get busy and get your share of it for a campaign contribution.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Now that you have a Republican Governor—I think he is a Republican Governor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. DINGELL. Why does he not take care of the situation in Detroit? [Applause.] I have heard the gentleman talk about former Governor Murphy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If Mme. Perkins would call off Brother Dewey, the Federal conciliator, that trouble could be ended.

The strike racketeers who are bleeding the workingmen of Michigan have not yet recovered from the foolish notion which they got when Frank Murphy, as Governor of Michigan, backed them up in their lawlessness and prevented the enforcement of the court's orders.

He is the man who aided in creating disrespect for law; who permitted the lawlessness—the "goon" squads and the wrecking crews of the C. I. O. to have their way in Michigan.

You may remember that not very long ago in just about 3 days Governor Dickinson, using less than a score of the same State police force that Governor Murphy had at Flint—yes; had there in addition to 370,000 members of the National Guard and yet permitted lawlessness—Governor Dickinson ended a strike at Pontiac, maintained respect for the law, and there was not even a broken nose or a bloody eye; while at Flint, under Murphy, many a man was sent to the hospital by the violence of the strikers.

If the Labor Department would keep its meddlesome fingers out of local affairs, would quit giving encouragement to those who would deprive American laboring men of their jobs, the hundred thousand men that are out of employment in your city of Detroit and elsewhere in the State because of the Chrysler strike would go back to work. [Applause.]

DO NOT LET THE NAVY BE MADE RIDICULOUS

On October 11, on the floor of the House, I charged that Local Union, No. 208, of the U. A. W., C. I. O., of Detroit, had with a picket line and by show of force prevented a representative of the United States Navy from taking possession of completed castings which were to be used in the construction of motors for aircraft. That it had refused to permit this representative of the Navy to pick up and ship out on a Government bill of lading patterns belonging to the Navy of the United States of America.

I further charged that this strike, which continued in one plant for 41 calendar days, in another for 24, had seriously interfered with the Navy's plans for national defense at the Government's aircraft factory located at the Navy Yard, Philadelphia, Pa.

In a letter dated October 20, Acting Secretary of the Navy Edison fully substantiated my charge and admitted that this union, through its picket line, had successfully defied the Navy.

That this union is still defying the Federal Government, and that its officials have no conception of the absurdity of their position and of their disloyalty, is indicated by a statement in a news dispatch from Detroit, which states that—

The C. I. O.'s automobile workers' union took issue today with the Navy Department charge that the recent C. I. O. strike against the Bohn Aluminum & Brass Co. in Detroit interfered with the Navy's national-defense program, declaring two union offers to cooperate were ignored.

International President R. J. Thomas, of the union, declared that the Navy twice turned down offers made by the union to cooperate.

Since when and from what source has the C. I. O. obtained the right to withhold property that belongs to the United States Navy and to demand that the question of its right to hold that property be a subject matter of negotiation?

We all know that the C. I. O. contended that the sit-down strike was legal—that is, that it had a legal right to take possession of the property of individuals or of corporations and drive fellow employees from their jobs. Even the United States Supreme Court's decision to the contrary has not convinced all those who support the sit-down, and has but changed the sit-down strike of the C. I. O. into the slow-down.

Now, the C. I. O. advances the preposterous proposition that not only may it interfere with the property rights of the individual employer, force the man who would work to pay tribute to it before he can go on his job, but it insists, and, so far, has made good on the proposition, that when the Navy demands patterns belonging to the Navy and which are needed for use in a Government-owned factory it may tell the Navy to "peddle its papers."

The President and official Washington may for political reasons submit to this affront because they do not care to further antagonize John L. Lewis, who only recently questioned the wisdom of the Government officials in now suggesting that the President have a third term. But the marines and the enlisted personnel of the Navy must be boiling mad and think it rather ridiculous to be building battleships costing millions of dollars and airplanes by the hundreds, and then surrendering to a picket line in Detroit. Must we put wheels on a battleship and send it to Detroit?

If the President does not want to order a Navy truck through the picket line to pick up material needed for national defense, he might suggest that the commandant at Annapolis permit the fourth, fifth, or sixth substitute Navy football team to take a crack at the Detroit picket line. Here is prophesying that those boys will go through that picket line like water over Niagara. They may not make a touchdown, but they will bring back the castings and patterns.

The folks are beginning to wonder just how far the Government by its inaction will go in supporting the C. I. O. and its organizing drive, and just what amount of cash the C. I. O., its affiliates, and Lewis will contribute to the President's third-term campaign fund.

We know that the activities of the National Labor Relations Board, the Senate Civil Liberties Committee, the coddling of the C. I. O. strikers by Governor Murphy, Mme. Perkins' views toward the legality of the sit-down strikes, the failure of the Labor Board to act upon the case of Harry Bridges, and the unrebuked use of the President's name have all helped immeasurably in the membership drive of the C. I. O. We know, too, that John L. Lewis' United Mine Workers gave the President's political organization \$470,000 in his last campaign and that other labor organizations contributed enough more to make a total of more than \$1,700,000.

We now learn from the press of November 1, 1939, that Lewis has levied two special assessments of \$1 each against the soft-coal workers, one payable in December and the other in January; and two assessments of \$1 each, payable in January and February, against the anthracite-coal workers. It was stated that he expected to realize from the two assessments approximately \$800,000. Might it be pertinent to inquire how much of the \$800,000 so collected from the wage earners will be devoted to political purposes, to further Lewis' personal political ambition?

The same news dispatches also carried the information that Lewis had begun the building of his war chest for 1940 by levying assessments, which leaders hoped would bring the union's total resources to nearly \$3,000,000 by next March.

By what authority does John L. Lewis compel the workers of America to contribute \$3,000,000 to be used by him and his executive committee? And by what authority does he divert a portion of that fund to political activities? And by what authority does he refuse to permit men and women to work until they have contributed to that fund? Is there any other organization in the United States of America which can charge a man a fee for the right to work to earn a livelihood? How much longer will this Government submit to this sort of tribute levying?

But to get back to the first point. Just how far are we to let any organization, labor, capitalistic, or communistic, defy our Navy? Here are two editorials, characteristic of many, which show that the people throughout the country are awakening to the situation; the first from the Enterprise News of October 31, published at Cambridge Springs, Pa.; the second from the Philadelphia Inquirer of November 2. I quote:

WHAT PULASKI DIED FOR

I had occasion to address the faculty and student body of Alliance College the other evening. We were honoring the memory of Pulaski, whose name has been familiar to millions of school children in America for the past 100 years. Pulaski was a Polish count—a nobleman—who lived only about a hundred years after Poland, as a nation, had her greatest flowering under a republican form of government in the seventeenth century. He hated autocracy wherever it was found. As a refugee from a newer government in Poland, he came to America, helped the Colonies mightily in the Revolution, and was mortally wounded at Savannah.

With all the diplomacy I could muster, I chose to wonder what we have in America today that would make the spirit of Pulaski sad. For, remember, he fought and died for freedom and against autocracy.

One of the saddest pictures, I think, is in Detroit at present, where there is plenty of employment in the Chrysler plants at good wages for workmen who do not dare to accept it. The C. I. O. union out there insists that its leaders should have the say about how fast production should move along the assembly lines, whereas almost everybody, I should think, will agree that this is something that logically and justly belongs in the hands of management. But, no matter, the leaders of the C. I. O. have called a strike.

I don't think Pulaski fought and died for that sort of thing. The pertinency of this incident is the fact that the Chrysler strike started in a Dodge plant, located in a suburb of Detroit, which is peopled mostly by Polish-Americans. They cannot help themselves, of course. If you are a member of a union and the leaders call a strike and you don't strike, you had better hire a bodyguard. You'll need it.

WILL THE GOVERNMENT STAND FOR THIS?

The incident of the stoppage of work on important Navy aircraft parts, due to a C. I. O. strike in a Detroit factory, is not closed by Acting Secretary Edison's report to the House Naval Affairs Committee.

It is now its duty to investigate his most serious charge: That the regional C. I. O. director refused to allow a representative of the Navy Department to pass through the picket line "to pick up Government-owned patterns and ship them on a Government bill of lading."

That is to say, the strikers were determined to prevent completion of the urgently needed naval equipment not only at the Detroit factory but anywhere else.

Mr. Edison adds: "No further action was taken by the Navy Department to remove the patterns and castings." The congressional committee should ask why.

Is there no power in Washington to which the Department could appeal? How about the Attorney General or the Secretary of Labor?

Why such a supine surrender to pickets who refused to let the Government recover its own property so that it could continue its aircraft building program?

According to the head of the United Automobile Workers, Mr. Edison omitted an essential fact. It was a subsequent offer by the union to meet with Navy Department officials in Washington and "attempt to adjust the matter."

But the larger fact remains, according to the Acting Secretary's report, that the concern which produces about 90 percent of the bearings used by American aircraft was tied up by strikers who blocked the Government's effort to have its imperatively needed work performed elsewhere.

In addition there is the humiliating fact, admitted by Mr. Edison, that the Government knuckled under to the strikers and their picket line.

For 6 weeks the Navy Department stood by while the plant that had contracted to do its work was forced to lie idle. For 6 weeks the officials who wished only to get back the Government's patterns, without taking any sides in the industrial dispute, submitted meekly to the strikers' edict.

If John L. Lewis and the C. I. O. possess a power in this country to which the Government must bow, it is time the American people awoke to the menace. It is up to the House Naval Affairs Committee to turn the searchlight on this ominous incident and suggest means for preventing a repetition.

Such high-handed dictation to the Government would not be permitted for a moment in wartime. Why should it be tolerated while the Nation is hastening to strengthen all its defenses to insure its peace?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has time and again made remarks on this floor which might be termed squawking, and all about Governor Murphy. The Republicans now have their chance with a strike, which is something of a problem, and the great Governor of Michigan, whom the Republicans are not so keen about, has an opportunity to change the situation. He has an opportunity now to settle the matter. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the labor department of the State of Michigan has been fussing around with this problem in Detroit and has not been getting anywhere. Then Mr. Dewey came in from Washington and he tried it. There was a great deal of noise about what Republicans called interference, so he withdrew. Now the Governor is hoping and praying and talking through some

sort of a pipe line or having a pipe dream and uttering a lot of shibboleths, but still the question of the strike is not settled. It comes with poor grace from the gentleman from Michigan to come here and mention the strike at this time. I think it would be better if nothing was said about it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not blame you for wanting to keep your dirty linen covered up down there.

Mr. DINGELL. It is not our dirty linen.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But how can you expect the Governor of a State to accomplish anything when the whole Navy Department and the Federal Government cannot, or will not, do it?

Mr. DINGELL. I will tell you just how he can do it, by the same recommendation that the gentleman has made, or at least by the attitude he has previously assumed, just go in there with the militia and shoot them down, as would be the gentleman's policy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Shoot them down, you say? Never at any time have I advocated shooting anyone, nor have I suggested shooting strikers or anyone else. I have suggested time and again the enforcement of the law. You would let them drive all the workers from their jobs.

Mr. DINGELL. That is what I would not have them do. [Here the gavel fell.]

MY REPLY TO THE CRITICS OF OUR ARMY AND OUR NATIONAL GUARD
Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago I received a letter from the American Defense Society, Inc., with headquarters in the city of New York. This letter contains a scathing criticism of the United States Army, its present strength and efficiency; and for the purpose of answering it and giving facts, I present to you the entire letter of September 26, 1939, signed by Robert Appleton, chairman of the American Defense Society, Inc.:

THE AMERICAN DEFENSE SOCIETY, INC.,
New York, N. Y., September 26, 1939.

To the Members of the Senate and House, Washington, D. C.:

(1) It is important that Americans awake to the fact that there are grave deficiencies in the small military forces provided by the Defense Act of 1920, especially in view of world conditions.

(2) The purpose behind that act was to provide a well-trained and well-equipped skeleton army which would be adequate in time of peace and which could form the nucleus of a large force in time of emergency.

(3) The recent maneuvers at Plattsburg, where the First Army had its first complete field exercises, showed a shocking condition of affairs.

(4) This First Army is assigned to cover the States along the northeastern seaboard, including, besides the New England States, the States of New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and the District of Columbia.

(5) It is supposed to be provided with small arms, artillery, and proper facilities for transportation. The First Army, when called into the field exercises, had a deficiency of 77 percent in its personnel. It had a shortage of 60 percent in small arms. Its light field artillery was short 38 percent. Transportation showed a shortage of 83 percent, and antiaircraft was 57 percent short.

(6) More serious even than the shortage in men and equipment, however, was the disclosure that a large percentage of the men who participated in the maneuvers showed that they had not been properly trained in caring for themselves, or in the use of their equipment.

(7) From the public statements of official observers of the maneuvers it is evident that Army officials and those concerned with maintaining adequate national defense are greatly exercised over the present state of our national military defenses.

(8) Discussing the disclosed deficiencies, Lt. Gen. Hugh A. Drum said at Plattsburg Barracks on August 25:

"There is only one way to overcome these deficiencies—the existence in peace of a field army. It need not be large, but efficiency demands that the units thereof exist in peace and that they be brought together more frequently for training in the field. In the World War we delayed the creation of such a force until war was upon us. If we had acted higher authorities agree that we might have kept out of the war. I know we would have saved many lives and have shortened the war. Certainly this lesson is most pertinent to world conditions of today."

(9) The theoretical total of the First Field Army is approximately 325,000 men. This figure should be measured against a

recent expansion from 180,000 to 227,000. Even this latter figure falls far short of the 280,000 authorized by the National Defense Act for the whole United States Army.

(10) Another important fact disclosed by the maneuvers is that it is not enough merely to bring the enlisted personnel up to the figure which military tacticians declare to be proper to meet possible emergencies.

(11) Three things are vital for the effective functioning of the forces responsible for the safety of the eastern seaboard:

1. It must have a headquarters staff in time of peace to plan and supervise the training and readiness of the First Army. Such headquarters staff does not now exist.

2. There must be at hand, at all times, adequate supplies of small arms, field artillery, and facilities for transportation of men and equipment.

3. Provision must be made for regular field maneuvers, where all arms of the service will be coordinated, where men will have personal experience of field conditions, and where the care and use of equipment can be learned.

(12) The only alternative to a large standing army, which is repugnant in a democracy, is the possession of a perfectly trained and equipped nucleus, which will give the Nation as a whole a chance to organize.

(13) At the present time the United States has neither the large army nor the effective nucleus, yet it is a truism of military tactics, that the Navy, the air force, and the land fortifications are incomplete without a trained army to protect and defend their bases and their sources of supply.

(14) Our Government at present is properly intent upon its naval and air defenses. With these activities the American Defense Society is in full accord.

(15) Equal attention, however, should be given to our land forces, and it is to this phase that this report is addressed.

(16) By revision of the National Defense Act and by Executive proclamation this small army should be created now. This would serve as a basis for the reorganization of the other field armies of the United States.

(17) We urge upon each member of the American Defense Society and upon every American the need for using every channel to express the national desire for tranquility and security in our land defenses.

(18) Our own experiences in the last war, and the present unsettled conditions throughout the world, alike indicate as a minimum of insurance that our small standing Army should be made as strong and as efficient as the brains and the resources of the Nation can produce and as our responsibilities demand.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT APPLETON, Chairman.

You will note that for convenience in answering some of the statements contained in this letter that I have numbered each paragraph from 1 to 18, inclusive, separately.

At the present time, with another world war prevailing in Europe, we are all vitally concerned with our own Army in the event of an emergency requiring its use for defense. At the present time, with the country in a condition of neutrality and peace, it behooves us all to give this matter our most earnest attention.

DEFICIENCIES IN PERSONNEL

Paragraph 5 of the letter of the American Defense Society, Inc., deals with deficiencies in Army personnel. It is true that there are deficiencies in the personnel of the Army; but I call your attention to the fact that on September 8, 1939, the President of the United States authorized an increase in the enlisted strength of both the Regular Army and the National Guard which will bring their respective strengths to 227,000 and 235,000. As the peacetime objective of these two components is 280,000 and 320,000, respectively, and the National Defense Act permits an authorized strength of 420,000 in the National Guard, there will yet remain a deficiency even when the recent authorized strength has been attained.

DEFICIENCIES IN EQUIPMENT

The same paragraph of the National Defense Society's letter makes reference to the deficiency in equipment. I wish to say that the War Department has on several occasions called to the attention of this Congress deficiencies in items of equipment. I have been informed that approximately one billion dollars will be required to provide for shortages in the critical items of munitions and for 45 percent of the shortages in the essential items, if we are to provide adequately for the total force of 600,000 as I have just indicated. "Critical items" are used in this sense as items unobtainable from any source within the time and quantity required, and requiring from 1 to 2 years for manufacture, and when items must be on hand in the event of

war. These items are normally thought of as heavy artillery and antiaircraft artillery, semiautomatic rifles, antitank guns, modernized artillery, ammunition, gas masks, and special combat vehicles. "Essential items," such as I now use the term, refers to items which are essential for field service and can be obtained from commercial sources. These items comprise many parts of equipment necessary for the training and maintenance of units in the field such as motor transportation, tentage, medical supplies, water purification, and field ranges.

Congress has made substantial appropriations to be used during the present fiscal year. It has supplemented these appropriations with the additional sum of \$110,000,000 which was placed in the Second Deficiency Act of 1939. These appropriations will enable the Army, so I am informed, to meet approximately 94 percent of the deficiencies in the critical items necessary for the use of the existing active forces. The appropriations, however, will not provide "essential items" for the present strength for the required "critical items" for a force of 600,000 men. Besides this fact we must remember, even with the funds now available for which procurement is under way, the deficiencies will continue to exist until actual deliveries of the new equipment are made and some of these deliveries cannot be completed until December 1941.

DEFICIENCIES IN TRANSPORTATION

Until the year 1934 our Army was still using the antiquated motor transportation left over from the World War. During that year, by Executive order, the sum of approximately \$10,000,000 was made available from P. W. A. funds to replace the worst of this wartime transportation and to permit the Army to inaugurate a modern motorized program. This provides for only a small part of the transportation required for field service and the additional sums of \$1,000,000 each year, which have been appropriated for motor transportation, have been barely sufficient to cover maintenance and replacements. The limited amount of transportation equipment on hand requires a pooling of vehicles of several units to permit one unit at a time to take the field for maneuvers. I am informed that it will require the sum of approximately \$60,000,000 merely for the purpose of equipping existing units with the motor vehicles on the basis of peacetime allowances. From these facts it is easily seen that Congress must give the Army tremendous increases in appropriations if we are to have completely mechanized units.

DEFICIENCIES IN TRAINING

The urgent need for the full training of the large units has always been recognized by those high in the councils of the War Department. In the past such training has been almost impossible due to (1) lack of funds for concentrating widely scattered units of the Regular Army and for leasing large areas and providing the necessary motor transportation; (2) the lack of special corps troops essential to such maneuvers; and (3) the lack of complete infantry divisions. The recent organization of the smaller triangular division should make it easier to bring about troop concentrations, thereby permitting the training of large units. I am advised that the Army is striving to complete the organization of five such divisions with necessary supporting or special corps troops and to give these divisions extensive field training. Such training costs money. It is estimated that approximately \$35,000,000 will be required to provide for 4 months' field training for the Regular Army and 2 weeks of such training for the National Guard and Organized Reserve. The costs for such troop concentrations are largely expended in rail and motor transportation, in the use of training ammunition, in the consumption of food and other supplies, and payment for land for the use in maneuvers.

The letter of the American Defense Society, which I have quoted, refers to the Army maneuvers recently held at Plattsburg, N. Y. The letter makes the charge that even more serious than the shortage of men and equipment was the discovery that a large percentage of the men who participated in the maneuvers at Plattsburg showed that they had not been properly trained in caring for themselves or in the use of their

equipment. Men can be properly trained only if time and means are available for their training. It is true that more training of our troops is desirable and even necessary to have an efficient force. At the same time it is my judgment that a great deal has been accomplished by the Army within the limited means available for this purpose. While I did not personally see the maneuvers at Plattsburg, I have been reliably informed that the bulk of the units were from the National Guard. When this is considered I believe the criticisms of the American Defense Society will be found to be unfair and rather harsh. In the past the National Guard has been limited because of funds to 2 weeks' field training and 48 armory training periods of 1½ hours each during the course of each year. The War Department advises me that the number of Army training periods has been increased from 48 to 60 per year, and in addition we know the funds are being sought to permit occasional week-end overnight training periods. When this is considered I am prepared to say that the National Guard has made excellent progress within the limit of the appropriations made by Congress for this purpose; and as additional funds are made available by Congress, I believe we will see excellent progress obtained.

Nor can I pause here without paying a tribute to those men in the National Guard who, to my own personal knowledge, have devoted much of their time, their energies, and their abilities in this patriotic service without pay. They have busied themselves in extra training periods without pay, studying range finding and other subjects for which time has not been available during their regular pay periods.

In conclusion, I wish to say that the Army as presently constituted needs no defense. It is true that we are all greatly concerned over the present state of our national-defense establishment. We are concerned as a Congress in making up the deficiencies of which we have knowledge. For successive years the General Staff of the Army has made recommendations to this House of Representatives and its committees for additional funds to properly enlarge, equip, and train our Army in all its component parts. Vast sums of money are required for such purposes. Congress, it is true, has yearly increased its appropriations but if we are to have that well-rounded, efficient, protective force which seems to be necessary in these trying hours, large additional appropriations are indispensable. The American people want the Army well and efficiently maintained, and it is my opinion that our people regard such additional appropriations as money well spent.

This extraordinary session of Congress will adjourn within the next few days. We will return to our respective homes and visit among our people. I feel that I know the heart of the American people; and when we reassemble in January, I believe we will bring back to our councils the audible demand of our constituency that we make available all funds necessary for an efficient, well-rounded defense army.

Mr. Brooks asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include therein a letter of the American Defense Society.

THE TREASURY STATEMENT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Majority Leader, and Members of the House, from the unusual request of the majority leader to permit the Speaker to declare the House in recess at any time, I presume that it is to be taken for granted that the majority leader intends that we adjourn this session of Congress today, or not later than Tuesday.

It seems to me in view of the very difficult time this country may have in keeping out of war it would be very well for the Congress to remain in session, in order that we may see that America is kept out of this war. If we adjourn, and return to our homes after passing the bill as now contemplated by the House and Senate, giving the President of the United States the power to designate the

war danger zones, I say we will be granting too much power to the President of the United States. That power should remain in the hands of the Congress.

Let me call your attention to the fact that when the President of the United States called this session of Congress and when, on September 21, he made his address to the Congress, he made this statement:

At this time I ask for no other authority from the Congress.

It seems to me utterly foolish and ridiculous and unjustifiable that this Congress would now grant the President of the United States the power to carry out the Neutrality Act which this Congress is going to put into effect and designate war zones. It is foolhardy, it is ridiculous, it is unsound, and it is un-American. The President himself made the statement that he did not want any authority, and yet you are going to put that great power in his hands. You persist in giving him power. You are not responsible to your constituents if you do such a thing.

I have been asked by some of the Members on the front row, "Where are you going to get the money?" That is a question I want to turn to now, Mr. Majority Leader. [Laughter.]

WHERE ARE YOU GOING TO GET THE MONEY?

I want to call your attention to the statement of October 30, issued by Mr. Morgenthau, a statement of the United States Treasury which is in black, but should be in red. It is not good bookkeeping; it is unethical and it is unsound. He shows that we are in the "red" as of that day \$1,416,540,-868.52. This means that by the end of this fiscal year, or by July 1 of next year, 1940, you are going to be in the "red" \$4,000,000,000. This administration has had a "red" balance ever since it has been in office. Let me show you what it is like:

Roosevelt's deficits

Mar. 4, 1933, to June 30, 1933-----	\$892,600,000
June 30, 1934-----	3,409,000,000
June 30, 1935-----	2,938,000,000
June 30, 1936-----	4,361,000,000
June 30, 1937-----	2,707,000,000
June 30, 1938-----	1,459,000,000
June 30, 1939-----	3,685,000,000
June 30, 1940 (estimated)-----	4,000,000,000
	23,451,600,000

A staggering sum. It will stagger generations for 100 years in America.

If cash and carry is good for neutrality legislation, it should be our motto in handling the affairs of our own Government. The only thing that will save you from going in the "red" \$4,000,000,000 this year is a war boom from Europe, or the fact that you might get into the war, and would then be able to cover up the Treasury statement so badly that you would not know where you are. That would be then a travesty on justice.

Let me call your attention to some of the statements made by the President of the United States when he was out campaigning for the office of the Presidency. On September 29, 1932, at Sioux City, Iowa, he made this statement:

We are not getting adequate return for the money we are spending in Washington, or, to put it another way, we are spending altogether too much money for government services that are not needed, practical, nor necessary. And then, in addition to that, we are attempting too many functions. We need to simplify what the Federal Government is giving to the people.

I accuse the present administration of being the greatest spending administration in peacetime in all our history. It is an administration that has piled bureau on bureau, commission on commission, and has failed to anticipate the dire needs and the reduced earning power of the people. Bureaus and bureaucrats, commissions and commissioners have been retained at the expense of the taxpayer.

Then in addition to that he said:

We are attempting too many functions.

Get that.

We need to simplify what the Federal Government is giving to the people.

No truer statement was ever made by a man that was running for office, but think how he has gone far afield from what he said then, with what he has been doing in the way of new departments of government, and greater expenditures of government. This administration has established more bureaus than any five previous administrations. It is a terrible thing to conceive, but I say to you Members of Congress that the war in Europe is not the great danger to America today. The great danger to America today is the break-down of our financial structure and our fundamental principles of the operation of government under our Constitution. I am sincere in that. It is the ruination of this country, and you Congressmen, if you live 5 years more at the way we are going now, you will live to see that, and you will live to rue it. It is Roosevelt and ruin. He wants to be a dictator. If not, let him return the power to Congress that you gave him and let him economize as he said he would do.

I call your attention now to the address made by the President of the United States on March 2, 1930, over the radio:

If we do not halt this steady process of building commissions and regulatory bodies and special legislation like huge inverted pyramids over every one of the simple constitutional provisions, we shall soon be spending many billions of dollars more.

That was a true statement then and it is more true today, but why does he not carry out those statements that he made at that time? It is horrible to conceive, and I say here that next January one of the first things you are going to be called upon to do is to increase the limit of the national debt from \$45,000,000,000 to probably \$75,-000,000,000 or maybe \$100,000,000,000, because it would not be too much money for this administration to spend if you are going to be in power for 8 years more. [Applause.] That, I hope, will not be the case. Then what is going to happen? Now, if you Members on the Democratic side think that is funny, by your laughing, if you think it is funny if we increase the national debt from \$45,000,000,000 to possibly \$100,000,000,000, then I want to tell you that there is something wrong in Congress, and we need new, conservative Congressmen. You may say that we are not fools, but we do the things that fools would do if we permit anything like that. This seems to be a funny thing for a good many Members of Congress today the way you seem to rejoice in the spending spree of this administration, but with me it is a serious thing, and it will be a serious situation with the rest of you some of these days when you look back at your record and see that you have been responsible for it—you Members who have been for everything that anybody wanted in your districts because it would mean votes for you, and you know that you broke this Government financially, and you know that you have broken down our form of government. Then it will be a serious thing for the American people.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does not the gentleman think this would be a pretty good time to remain in session, stay on the job, and try to watch the foreign situation and at the same time take care of the tax problem and national-defense problem and the farm problem and a number of other problems confronting this Congress and the country?

Mr. RICH. I think the gentleman is correct and that is the reason why I think the request of the majority leader should not have been granted but that the Speaker should permit Members of Congress to come in here and try to find a solution for these many problems. If you gentlemen think you can keep on spending and spending and going into the "red" at the rate of four or five billion dollars a year, you will find out that there is a wreck ahead. Here is what the President said in his speech at Pittsburgh, October 19, 1932:

The credit of the family depends chiefly upon whether that family is living within its income. And that is equally true of the Nation. If the Nation is living within its income its credit is good.

If in some crises it lives beyond its income for a year or two it can usually borrow temporarily at reasonable rates. But if, like a spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds and is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending; if it extends its taxing to the limit of the people's power to pay and continues to pile up deficits, then it is on the road to bankruptcy.

Why not put cash and carry in effect while operating our Government, Mr. President? Cash and carry is good in neutrality. Cash and carry should be good in Government operation. We should raise as much cash from our people as we spend.

If you spend more than you receive then cut down your expenses. That is the sensible thing to do. That is a true statement I just quoted from the President. You know that we are on the road to bankruptcy today under this administration and you laugh at it. We have been on that road ever since this administration has been in power. The President said he was going to balance the Budget after 3 years. He has not been even close to a balance and he never will. But next year you will be off balance more than you have ever been since Mr. Roosevelt has been in office, notwithstanding the year you paid the soldiers' bonus. And it is a horrible, unjustifiable, unbusinesslike manner of running our Government. Never was such poor management shown as by this administration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes in answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has just passed to me a Treasury statement of recent date. I am afraid that the limited time I have will not permit me to get down that far.

I want to begin with the Mellon administration. You Republicans keep saying that a President ought not to serve three terms; yet it has been pointed out that Andrew Mellon served three terms. It is the Mellon administration I want to discuss.

There are a great many people who think we are headed for a European war. As far as I am concerned, I shall do everything I can to keep us out of it, but if we do go into war, the World War veterans in this House are going to see to it that the "dollar-a-year men" do not come out of the war multimillionaires. [Applause.]

We are going to see to it that these international blood-suckers, known as international bankers and munitions makers, do not coin their millions out of the blood and tears of the suffering people of the world and then get away with it when the war is over. [Applause.]

We are going to see to it that curbstone patriots, wordy warriors, and long-distance heroes do not pace up and down the streets clamoring for war and then dodge the draft. [Applause.]

We are going to see to it that what happened after the last war does not occur again. If the tax laws that were in force at the time the war closed had never been repealed by the Republican administration, we would have paid the national debt off by 1930. [Applause.]

I love the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] as much as it is lawful for a Democrat to love a Republican, but he talks about taxing the profits of this war. I am not only in favor of taxing the profits on this next war, but I want to go back and tax the profits on the last war. Then you will not have so much propaganda for us to get into the next war. [Applause.]

When the Sixty-seventh Congress convened, I was here; the Republican Party was then in power. Very few of these service men were here then; but the Republican machine was here, and in power, and, by the way, the head of it was from Pennsylvania. They began to take the taxes off the big interests, and they continued to do so until they took off hundred of millions, if not billions of dollars annually that we needed to balance the Budget. Not satisfied with that, they gave back four or five billion dollars, all told,

of taxes that had already been collected, and continued that policy until 1929.

In addition to that they refunded the foreign debt, spread it over 62 years, and reduced the interest so far below the rate we have to pay on the bonds this Government issued to get the money for them, that we lost \$6,200,000,000. This was done to strengthen the securities the large financial interests in this country held in Europe, the international bankers, if you please, who made hundreds of millions out of the war.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Let me finish my statement, please.

If you will go back and search the RECORD you will find that when Mr. Green, of Iowa, was chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, about 1924, they brought in a bill to return hundreds of millions of dollars to the big-income and inheritance taxpayers who got rich, or increased their wealth, out of the war, when the administration then in power was fighting and protesting and bemoaning us for attempting to pay the soldiers their adjusted-service certificates. I rose and pointed out to Mr. Green that he was denying what he called the bonus to the soldiers, but was giving a bonus to the big rich of this country who were able to pay and who made a large part of their money out of the World War.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. No; let me finish this statement. I will yield in time. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin for a question.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. How about the Democratic Party playing Santa Claus in a big way when they forced our American citizens to turn in all of their gold to the Government for \$20.67 an ounce or go to jail for 5 years and then imported almost \$11,000,000,000 worth of gold from foreigners and paid them \$35 an ounce for it?

Mr. RANKIN. Now, that is the first wall of the gold bug I have heard in a long time. [Laughter]. I will come to the gold standard in a minute.

In 1929—the reason I yielded to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] was because he was here at the time—one of the first things they did after Mr. Hoover was inaugurated President, when everybody knew the country was broke and that we were headed into the greatest depression of all time, one of the first things they did was to bring in a bill here to turn back, I believe it was, \$215,000,000 of taxes that had already been paid by people of this country who were most able to pay.

I led the fight against it. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] was here at that time, and my recollection is that he opposed me on it.

Now, if we would impose the taxes we ought to put on those interests that want to get rich out of the war, if we would restore wartime taxes, go back and tax those who got rich out of the last war, we would at least be moving a long ways toward balancing the Budget.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I yield for a question, not a speech.

Mr. RICH. I would like to make the statement that on yesterday I voted on repeal of the embargo with the gentleman from Mississippi, showing that I did not want manufacturers in this country to make a profit out of war. I will go with the gentleman to vote that we cut the profit down to nothing on manufactures of war materials, but that is not the question.

Mr. RANKIN. I did not vote to repeal the embargo, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania knows it, if he was here.

Mr. RICH. And I said the gentleman did not. Neither did I.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman for a question, for I want to be courteous, but I ask that he not take up all my time.

Mr. RICH. When Mr. Mellon was Secretary of the Treasury and we had a debt of \$28,000,000,000, did he not reduce the debt from \$28,000,000,000 down to \$16,000,000,000 during his time?

Mr. RANKIN. No. Now, will the gentleman let me answer that in all politeness?

Mr. RICH. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. I will tell you how he reduced it. He reduced it by canceling war contracts and taking credit for the proposed appropriations that were not spent. He reduced it by selling goods that had been produced to carry on the war. He did not do it by taxation and would never have done it by taxation.

And listen. At the time the Republicans were giving back by the hundreds of millions the taxes that had already been collected the Budget was not being balanced by taxation.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. BOLAND. I presume that by his reference to recipients of taxes that were paid back the gentleman refers among others, to the Bethlehem Steel Co., which received \$100,000,000 back taxes.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not know how much money the Bethlehem Steel Co. received, but I do not question but that they got certainly not less than \$100,000,000.

Another thing, Eugene Meyer was head of the Federal Reserve System. I believe he succeeded W. P. G. Harding. He had gone into a huddle with the Republicans and agreed to contract the currency and started this policy of deflation that has been followed ever since, and finally led to that of burying our gold in the ground.

If we are ever going to get out of this condition, if we ever intend to balance the Budget and restore prosperity, we are going to have to stop borrowing money from the rich and giving it to the poor for the rest of us to pay back with compound interest; we are going to have to take that gold out of the ground in Kentucky and use it to expand the currency to bring back commodity prices and restore prosperity.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am in hearty accord with the gentleman's views. Does the gentleman think, though, that it is really necessary to use the gold? In other words, we could have a national currency quite as well without using the gold as we could with it, could we not? The question of value is psychological, is it not?

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from California that I have watched the managed currencies of the world for the last 10 years, and I realize the great danger of attempting a purely managed currency. I am of the opinion that if we would go back to a bimetallic standard of gold and silver with the reasonable ratio of 16 to 1, and issue currency against the gold we now have under the present law, which requires us to put up only 40 percent of gold behind every dollar, we could issue a sufficient amount of money to restore agricultural prices, to restore prosperity, to balance the Budget, and bring permanent prosperity to the American people; take people off the relief rolls and keep them off. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I asked unanimous consent to insert my own remarks immediately after the two speeches by Hon. ROBERT F. RICH and Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN today, involving the action of the Republican Party in relation to the changes made in the tax rates, the tax collections, the payments on our public debt, and the effects of these changes. I did this because of the very limited time allotted to these gentlemen made a clear understanding of the matter quite difficult. In an address delivered on the floor of this House on February 24, 1936, I discussed this whole question, citing the facts and official figures on the entire subject. So many Members and thinkers on the subject have commented on that speech, and I have been asked for so many copies of that speech, that it occurred to me that it ought to be repeated for the general information it contains. Therefore I offer that speech under the unanimous consent granted to me for that purpose.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, we now have up for consideration the agricultural appropriation bill.

LXXXV—87

Mr. KELLER. Where are we going to get the money?

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman wants me to answer the question, which is somewhat irregular at this time, may I say that I do not think there is a Member of the House of Representatives who can answer the question, because I have asked it over and over for the past year. If there is any Member here who has the ingenuity, the initiative, and brains enough to get up here and answer the question, I will yield him my time right now; and the gentleman from Illinois is the man I should like to have try to answer the question.

Mr. KELLER. I can do it.

Mr. RICH. All right. I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, we have heard much about this question, Where are you going to get the money?—that I interjected the question for the purpose of answering it. It is a simple matter to get the money we need, and it always has been a simple matter. There has been much talk about balancing of the Budget, but there has not been a definition given as to what we mean by the "Budget." Somebody ought to get up here and tell us something about it. I am going to do just that, modest as I am in making the statement.

Mr. Chairman, 4 years ago, when the question of balancing the Budget came up, I went to the trouble to look up the subject with the greatest of care from the beginning of our Government to the present moment.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is the gentleman going to make the official answer now as to where his party is going to get the money? In other words, is he speaking officially? I mean, does the gentleman represent the Democratic Party?

Mr. KELLER. I am representing KENT E. KELLER only, and that is sufficient for this time.

Since we started in we have been out of debt once in our lifetime as a nation, and then only for a short time. That was under "Old Hickory" Jackson. That was the only time we have ever been out of debt.

On the average, every 2 years and 11 months from the beginning of our history to the present time, a full year has been a deficit year; a year in which we did not get money enough to pay our bills for that year—that is, to balance the Budget. I want you to get this, because when we go to discussing balancing the Budget and where we are going to get the money and how we are going to get the money, we ought to see what we have done in the past, because that is going to show us whether we can or whether we cannot get the money.

If we have in the past, we can in the future. Our Treasury report shows that in the 144 years of our constitutional government, from 1789 to 1933, both inclusive, there have been 49 annual deficits—a little more than one-third of the years of our national existence have been years of unbalanced Budgets. Thirteen of those years, at most, were war years. Thirty-six years of unbalanced Budgets were peacetime years. All the war years were years with unbalanced Budgets. Of the 131 years of peace, 1 year out of each 3 years and 8 months showed a deficit—that is, we did not take in as much as we spent. The whole 144-year period taken together shows that on the average 1 year out of every 2 years and 11 months has been a deficit year with its unbalanced Budget. Did all these years of unbalanced Budgets ruin our credit? Did we ever fail to pay? Certainly not.

Mr. KNUTSON. Tell us how to get the money first.

Mr. KELLER. Wait just a minute. I am going to tell you how to get the money.

Following the Civil War, this country owed a Federal indebtedness of 17½ percent of our total national wealth. Now get that. At the close of the Civil War the United States Government owed 17½ percent of our total national wealth, and no less than that. Did it cause us to go broke in paying it? Certainly not. We nearly paid it off before we came to the last war. We could have paid it out long ago if we had tried to, or if we had been more interested in paying off our indebtedness than in reducing the taxes of the rich people and prosperous corporations.

What next? From that time until this, or, from the close of the Civil War to the present war, we have learned how to produce about three and a half times as much wealth, man for man, as we could have done or as we did at that period. This simply shows that if we could pay 17½ percent of our national wealth at the end of the Civil War that we could, if necessary, pay three and a half times that proportion of our national wealth reckoned on our most prosperous years, if we needed to.

This is the first thing I want to get clear to you. I want you to see that this question of balancing the Budget is not only not vital but it is a piece of nonsense, in my judgment, to bring it out every time we get up here and talk about it, unless we know what we are talking about.

Now, if we have done these things in the past, we can do them in the future. I say to you, frankly, that our necessities at the present time are as great or greater than at any period in our history, even including our periods of war. We are under as great obligation to pay whatever taxes are necessary to take us out of these conditions, and keep us out, as we have been at any time in our entire history.

Now, you ask how are we going to pay? I want to call your attention to one more thing which I have heretofore called to the attention of this House when I was a great deal newer here than I am now, and that is this: Following the World War, if we had continued the taxes on the tax books at that time, inside of the first 10-year period we would have paid every penny we owed. If you want to verify this, get the tables prepared on this subject by the Joint

Committee on Internal Revenue Taxes that serves the House and Senate together. All you have got to do is to go back to the speech delivered by my colleague from an adjoining district, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PARSONS], who submitted these facts to this body.

What did we do? I will tell you what we did. Instead of paying it when we had it to pay, we turned around in 1921 and reduced the income tax shamefully, and only a few men had the vision and the understanding to see where it was leading us. We could have paid the whole thing inside the first 10 years. We could have paid the soldiers' adjusted compensation at that time and never missed the money if Congress had desired to do that. But did they desire to? Oh, no. The Congress considered it much more desirable to serve the very rich people and the very prosperous corporations than to pay the soldiers their compensation. So they completely wiped out the excess-profits tax in 1921, because the income and excess-profits taxes alone had brought in \$4,000,000,000 for the fiscal year of 1920, making a total national revenue income of \$6,694,000,000 for 1 year's taxes, actually collected in cash. But the tender-hearted Congress could not stand such cruelty to the war profiteers. So, to protect these friends of theirs, they put the soldiers off without a penny. Again, in 1924, the Congress reduced the income tax and gave the soldiers a rain check, good after 20 years. I am proud of the fact that this Congress has provided for cashing these rain checks 9 years before that income-tax-reducing Congress intended it should be done. Not only this, but if we had known enough to do this, we might also have known enough to prevent the panic that succeeded in 1929.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. KELLER. Certainly. We could have had money enough in our Treasury so that as men fell out of employment for technological reasons, we could have reemployed them in the service of this Government and there need not have been a single, solitary unemployed man in America.

Mr. KNUTSON. Where are you going to get the money?
Mr. KELLER. In just a moment I am coming to that.
There need not have been a single idle man in America, because there are at the present time, and there have been for the last 100 years, a sufficient number of national projects of permanent value to have taken up every solitary man who fell into idleness through no fault of his own.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?
Mr. KELLER. Surely.

Mr. SNELL. I understood the gentleman to say that he objected to the fact that they reduced the income-tax rates.
Mr. KELLER. I certainly said that.

Mr. SNELL. If I recall correctly, the reduced income-tax rates brought in more income to the Government than the former rates.

Mr. KELLER. The gentleman ought to go back and look up the record on that.

Mr. SNELL. I think that statement is correct.
Mr. KELLER. The gentleman is wrong about that.
Mr. SNELL. I think that is right.
Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. KELLER. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. Is not that statement so?
Mr. KELLER. No; it is not so. The fiscal year of 1920 brought in from income and excess-profits taxes \$4,000,000,000 in cash. After the Congress reduced the income taxes in 1921, the income from that source fell to just half that amount in 1922 and never again reached even that figure. The gentleman will find this statement literally true from the Treasury receipts, and no statement even by Mr. Mellon can change the fact I here state.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not undertake to say that I know everything or know anything, but I simply express my own opinion—
Mr. RICH. Let Mr. Keller talk—he knows everything.
Mr. KELLER. Sure, I do—for your benefit. I am giving you what you need if you will only heed it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very sorry for my friends from Pennsylvania, who has to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER] to yield to him in the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. It is very unfortunate, but the gentleman from Illinois has yielded to me.

We had a depression in 1920 and 1921, and, of course, the amount of income taxes was reduced during that depression. Naturally, when business came back the returns in revenue from existing law increased, and I think my distinguished friend from New York realizes that the depression of 1920-21 sharply reduced the national income, but the national income came back very rapidly because we whipped out of that depression very quickly.

Mr. SNELL. Every time the income tax has been reduced it has returned more income to the National Government.

Mr. KELLER. The gentleman from New York is mistaken, completely and entirely mistaken. I am rather suspecting my friend from New York believes the statements he hears made in the stump speeches of his party.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. KELLER. I yield with pleasure to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. From what the gentleman has said, he is going to get the money from taxation.

Mr. KELLER. Certainly. That is where all money for carrying on government comes from, always has, always will, always ought to.

Mr. GIFFORD. Is the gentleman ready to vote for those taxes?

Mr. KELLER. Certainly. When a proper tax bill is presented I will vote for it and work for it all the way down the line. Now, I want to follow this up. In 1924 we again reduced the income

taxes, and again we gave back by a joint resolution taxes that were due, that already belonged to the people of this country. In 1926 we reduced the income tax and again gave back by joint resolution a year's taxes that belonged to the people.

Mr. SNELL. The conditions throughout the country in 1924 and 1928 were about the same.

Mr. KELLER. No.
Mr. SNELL. When we reduced the taxes in 1924 it produced more income for the National Government.

Mr. KELLER. Of course, the gentleman from New York has a perfect right to be wrong if he insists on it. But the Treasury receipts show the personal income taxes for 1924 to have been \$704,265,390 and the corporation income tax to have been \$881,549,546—a total income-tax receipts of \$1,585,814,936—the lowest receipts for any year over a 10-year period prior to 1931.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. KELLER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman is an expert on taxation. Has he given any consideration to the cutting down of governmental expenses?

Mr. KELLER. Yes; that has been my work for many years. [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLARD. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. KELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MILLARD. Does not the gentleman think that he has gotten this time under false pretenses? [Laughter.] The gentleman said he was going to tell us how to get the money, and he has not started yet, and his time is almost up.

Mr. KELLER. I have answered the gentleman's question already.
Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. Certainly.
Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman name one bill where he has voted to cut down governmental expenses?

Mr. KELLER. Yes; I voted for one of your bills. [Laughter.]
Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman name it?

Mr. KELLER. Well, I will look it up and get the name and the number. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman says he has been engaged in cutting down governmental expenses for years—does not the gentleman think that that was love's labor lost? [Laughter.]

Mr. KELLER. I do not think so. Now, to get back to this reduction of income tax. In 1928 you reduced the income tax and gave back certain taxes. In 1929, in December, when Congress met, when every man who knew anything about economic history knew that we were facing a national panic—knew that every time we have had a major stock crash on the stock market we have had a national panic, followed by a national depression. Of that there can be no doubt and is none. Yet in 1929, under those conditions, facing a panic, with men falling out of jobs every day, this Congress voted to again reduce the income taxes and give back supposedly \$160,000,000 to the successful corporations and to the successful income-tax gatherers—those who had incomes.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. KELLER. Yes; certainly.

Mr. SNELL. How can you give back something you never have had?

Mr. KELLER. I will tell the gentleman how to give back something you never have had. Just vote as you did in 1929, when the money was due, and you voted to give it back, before it was paid. You did that in 1929, in 1928, in 1926, in 1924, and 1921.

Mr. SNELL. But I still maintain that you cannot give back something that you never have had, and I also maintain that those tax measures produced more than the others did, and I would ask the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHERN] to confirm that.

Mr. KELLER. And I will bring that back to the gentleman and quote what your Secretary of the Treasury said, that whenever you put too high an income tax, the rich man will not pay. I quote from a letter from Mr. Mellon to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee dated November 10, 1923:

"Ways will always be found to avoid taxes so destructive in their nature, and the only way to save the situation is to put the taxes on a reasonable basis that will permit business to go on and industry develop."

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman obtained his time to tell us where they are going to get the money.

Mr. KELLER. But I have answered that question a few moments back. Through taxes, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman to grant me 5 minutes more.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman obtained his time from the other side.

Mr. RICH. Give him some time so that he can answer the question because he has not said anything yet.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. KELLER. Yes; to my friend from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Is it not a fact that during that very period huge income-tax refunds, and one item of \$45,000,000 refunded to the Steel Trust in 1927, which was collected in 1917?

Mr. KELLER. And is it not a fact that during that period this body voted a law that originally provided that unless when you paid the income tax you protested you had no right to go back and ask for a

rebate? This body revoked that law in 1924, and they went back, and my recollection is they paid out of the Treasury of this country about \$4,000,000,000 in rebates.

Mr. GIFFORD. And having reimposed all of the income taxes last year, all that we could get revenue from, if the gentleman is now going to get his money from taxes, will he tell us what kind of taxes?

Mr. KELLER. I shall be glad to do that, though I by no means agree we have reimposed all the income taxes that we could get revenue from. We are going to get some more from income taxes, in my judgment.

Mr. GIFFORD. But we are getting all we can.

Mr. KELLER. Oh, no; we are not. We are going to go, in my judgment, to as low exemptions as will pay for the collection. In England they are down to as low as \$600 a year, and we will come to that right here. We are going to come to it, and we are going to take it all the way up through, and if the sixteenth amendment has not been nullified by the Court, since we are talking about the Constitution, we will enforce the law and we can get all the money that we need without hurting anybody.

We are going to take it, and do not think we are not. We are not only going to take whatever tax money we need, but we are going to accept the responsibility of coming here as a government and saying to every American man and woman, "There is a job ready for every man and woman who wants to work," and we are going to see to it that they have that job, and when we do that we will produce so much wealth that there will be no longer any excuse for poverty in this country of ours. And when we guarantee a job to every man and woman who wants to work, no man now out of a job, nor who has been out of a job, nor whose job has ever been endangered, as they all have been, not a one of them will object to paying a small income tax to insure himself a job and his children after him. It will be the cheapest possible job insurance; the very greatest security to men, to business, to governmental institutions. That is the only solution for unemployment—the guaranty of an opportunity to earn a living—a competency, in fact.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. To my colleague from Massachusetts, surely, with pleasure.

Mr. TREADWAY. To ask the gentleman whether he thinks the program of taxation to which he has referred, going to the very lowest salaried people, to the point where it will simply be paying for the collections, will be a very popular tax with those in control of the Democratic Party, just before election?

Mr. KELLER. Let me suggest to the gentleman that he take that home to his own party and see what it says about it.

Mr. TREADWAY. I am asking the gentleman. He has stated in an authoritative way—

Mr. KELLER. Oh, no.

Mr. TREADWAY. What the majority party here are going to do.

Mr. KELLER. No; I am not stating any such thing.

Mr. TREADWAY. I would like to know whether he thinks that will make votes for his party at the coming election and if that theory will not make votes, then I prophesy just as strongly that the theory that the gentleman is proposing will not be carried out by the Democratic majority.

Mr. KELLER. The gentleman may be entirely right as to that. But I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did not say that I was speaking officially. I said that I was speaking for KENT E. KELLER and nobody else.

Mr. TREADWAY. But we respect Mr. KENT E. KELLER's position as one of the leaders of the Democratic Party.

Mr. KELLER. I have never been so accused before. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The suggestion of the gentleman from Massachusetts, a member of the Ways and Means Committee, indicates that he judges the Democratic Party by the standards of the Republican Party. He knows that they approach a question of that kind, especially matters of taxation, with a view to the welfare of the Republican Party and to political benefits, rather than the welfare of the country. That is the viewpoint of his party, and he just naturally assumes that the Democratic Party proceeds on the same basis as the Republican Party. That is a false assumption.

Mr. TREADWAY. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he disputes the accuracy of the statement I made?

Mr. KELLER. I do not yield, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TREADWAY. I said that the Democratic Party would not make this kind of taxes to which the gentleman from Illinois has referred. I stand by it, and I ask the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] whether he disputes that or not?

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BURDICK. The gentleman from Illinois has been given the floor to explain where we are going to get the money. If about 40 of these curious ones would leave him alone long enough, perhaps he can tell us.

Mr. WEARIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield.

Mr. WEARIN. If I remember correctly, we have had about \$7,000,000,000 in emergency appropriations since the Democratic Party came into power. I believe it is true that there has been an increase of approximately \$67,000,000,000, or thereabouts, in

bank deposits, national income, and things of that character since President Roosevelt came into power. That might be one way in which we could pay that debt of \$7,000,000,000.

Mr. KELLER. Certainly.

Mr. LAMBETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield.

Mr. LAMBETH. Does not the gentleman think that the best progress we could make toward balancing the Budget is to get the national income returned to normal, and has that not been gradually, steadily, and appreciably increasing ever since the present administration went into power on March 4, 1933?

Mr. KELLER. The gentleman has anticipated exactly what I am coming to, and I thank him for doing so. In 1928 and 1929 our national income was about \$90,000,000,000 a year.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I will in just a moment. Our income fell to under \$40,000,000,000; about thirty-seven and a half billion, as I recall. We have returned it, through some method or other to about fifty-five billion. But what I want to put to every one of you, not as a partisan matter but as a matter of common sense, is this, that the minute we return our national income we will have no trouble in paying whatever amount of taxes we may require.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And relief goes out?

Mr. KELLER. And relief goes out. The gentleman from Michigan makes a suggestion, and it is a splendid suggestion, that just as soon as we return the national income, relief goes out, naturally and properly.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Has the gentleman any figures to show whether or not the drop in national income from 1929 to 1932, and the increase from 1932 to 1936, bear any relationship to the drop and increase, respectively, of the national income in other countries, and of world income?

Mr. KELLER. Oh, yes; I have a great deal.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Will the gentleman put those figures in the Record, please?

Mr. KELLER. Yes; I will. I make this suggestion to the gentleman, that the proof of the fall of national income, the proof of panic, the proof of depression, lies in one thing—that is, the percentage of unemployment in the country. I want to call this to your attention. I am going to give you facts. The fact is that at the present time all of Europe, with its 550,000,000 people, has about six and one-quarter million unemployed. The United States, with its 127,000,000 people, has more than 10,000,000 unemployed. Can the gentleman tell us why this is true?

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Despite the resourceful and beneficent administration we have had during the last 3 years?

Mr. KELLER. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. You cannot parallel them to save your soul.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. But we still have actually 11,400,000 unemployed.

Mr. KELLER. The parallel is not there.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Green last week said there were 11,400,000 out of employment. Harry Hopkins says we are going to have more on relief now than we had a year ago. If we are getting better, why the unemployment and why the greater amount of relief?

Mr. KELLER. I do not say we are getting better on unemployment. I did not say I accepted Mr. Green's figures. I gave the figure I consider conservative, although I think Mr. Green is practically right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the gentleman has made a very powerful argument and a complete answer. The answer was so complete that they now have to ask the gentleman about unemployment. I think the gentleman has made a powerful and compelling answer. [Applause and laughter.] I might make the observation that when we get back to 1929 levels with the present tax laws on the statute books it is conservatively estimated that the Government will receive a revenue of \$8,000,000,000 a year.

Mr. KELLER. And that, of course, will enable us to do what we have to do.

Mr. LAMBETH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I think the gentleman is the best pinch hitter in the House of Representatives. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLER. I thank the gentleman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

ALICE EVERETT COX

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 304

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Alice Everett Cox, widow of O. E. Cox, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary compensation, and an additional amount, not to exceed \$250, to defray funeral expenses of the said O. E. Cox.

The resolution was agreed to.

LATIN AMERICAN TRADE

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the membership to House Joint Resolution 394, which I introduced in the House and which has been introduced in the Senate.

This resolution provides for the establishment of a joint congressional committee, consisting of five Members of the Senate and five Members of this House, to make a thorough study and investigation of the ways and means by which the United States may assist and contribute to the improvement of the economic, commercial, and cultural relations between the various American republics.

This investigation is important, not only from the viewpoint of improving Latin American trade relations, but also because it will bring out the problem of the cultural penetration of Latin America by Germany and Italy, with its consequent threat to the peace of this continent, and should disclose how this penetration and threat can be met by the United States.

I will present the Congress with further facts in support of this resolution early next session, and I will appreciate your support in getting it adopted.

The Department of Commerce figures indicate that Latin America is an important customer in the world markets. In 1937 the 20 Latin American republics purchased \$1,636,000,000 worth of goods in the world market, or 5.9 percent of all the world's imports for that year. In the same year these republics sold \$2,390,000,000 worth of goods in the world market, or 9.5 percent of all the world's exports for that year.

In 1937 the United States bought \$672,000,000 worth of goods from Latin America, which was 21.7 percent of our total imports; and in the same year the United States sold \$578,000,000 worth of goods to Latin America, or 17.2 percent of our total exports.

It is interesting to look at the Department of Commerce figures, expressed in terms of percentage, covering Latin American purchases from the chief industrial countries during 4 key years, and sales to these countries during the same years. The years are 1913, which is the pre-World War year; 1929, which is the peak boom year; 1937, the year of postdepression recovery; and 1938, which is supposed to be a slump year.

Sales to Latin America

	1913	1929	1937	1938 ¹
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
United States.....	25.03	38.7	34.3	36.1
United Kingdom.....	24.42	14.9	12.6	12.2
Germany.....	16.55	10.8	15.3	17.0
France.....	8.32	5.1	2.9	3.5
Italy.....	4.98	5.0	2.6	3.1
Japan.....	.14	1.0	2.7	2.6

¹ Estimated.

Purchases from Latin America

	1913	1929	1937	1938 ¹
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
United States.....	30.78	34.0	31.1	31.7
United Kingdom.....	21.24	18.5	17.6	16.3
Germany.....	12.38	8.1	8.7	10.6
France.....	7.99	6.2	4.0	4.0
Italy.....	1.99	3.0	3.1	1.5
Japan.....	.09	1.0	1.6	1.3

¹ Estimated.

During 1937 and 1938 England lost ground in Latin America, both in sales and purchases, while Germany gained as a result of its barter program. The principal export items of the United Kingdom to Latin America in 1937, and the principal

export items of Germany to Latin America in 1938, are as follows:

Principal export items of United Kingdom to Latin America in 1937

[In thousands of dollars]

Article	Argentina	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Mexico	Peru	Uruguay	Venezuela
Total.....	99,094	34,838	9,411	14,963	8,596	5,931	11,418	8,788
Coal.....	10,838	2,922					1,436	
Cotton.....								
Piece goods.....	15,895	275	1,386	7,304	623	790	1,157	3,109
Thread.....	1,860	558	505	515			992	
Yarns.....	3,602	1,076	555	638	378			
Disinfectants, etc.....	1,298							
Electric goods and apparatus.....	2,694	712	364	26	56	146	54	145
Iron and steel manufactures.....	17,270	3,312	1,137	519	1,489	541	835	1,060
Locomotives, trams, and parts.....	1,923	6,162	65	153		457	98	
Machinery and parts.....	6,292	5,112	609	800	1,164	511	449	591
Motor vehicles and aircraft.....	1,747	1,057	166			102	670	
Paper, cardboard.....	1,110	169	118	83		42	78	38
Pottery, ceramics.....	1,063	365	80	31		84	114	61
Rayon and silk manufactures.....	1,165	176	201	123	393	60	111	64
Sodium compounds.....	1,024	1,573	154		88	68	122	
Spirits.....	1,196	290	47		214	145	234	228
Woolen and worsted tissues.....	10,852	405	1,260	1,787	300	560	1,054	584

Principal export items of Germany to Latin America in 1938

[In thousands of dollars]

Articles	Argentina	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Mexico	Peru	Uruguay	Venezuela
Total exports.....	59,174	64,863	24,310	16,587	18,407	12,432	14,405	15,391
Coal.....	1,597	4,516				9	106	29
Paper and wares.....	2,227	680	593	611	1,307	434	506	
Clay and earthenware.....	1,886	478	315	371	428	294	330	272
Pharmaceuticals.....	2,567	3,743	975	2,057	2,486	639	371	849
Steel and iron pipes.....	1,821	1,240	488	499	390	229	193	2,197
Iron bars, shapes and other iron wares.....	9,173	7,627	3,098	2,235	462	333	2,620	1,839
Leather and textile machinery.....	1,301	3,152	496	447	526	172	408	149
Locomotives.....	1,902	1,700	59			11	41	
Power machinery.....	1,371	1,477	636	263	466	314	189	317
Printing machinery.....	1,213	733	391	125	155	364	137	121
Motor vehicles and aircraft.....	2,729	3,417	3,208	283	324	880	1,155	397
Electro-technical equipment.....	4,545	3,718	2,150	712	855	622	1,281	560
Chemical products and dyes.....	4,261	4,025	597	526	663	207	276	172
Precision instruments and optical.....	1,109	1,635	403	298	488	270	106	332
Textiles (cotton and wool).....	1,593	782	2,361	1,665	510	1,558	465	804

As a result of the present war in Europe there is virtually no export trade from England to Latin America, and absolutely none from Germany; and it is this vast trade that United States industry can secure and keep if it is handled on a firm foundation and with a proper understanding of the problems involved.

The future of the United States lies to the south, and if we bend our efforts to effecting closer relationship with Latin America we will never worry about getting entangled with the petty quarrels of old Europe.

Too few of us realize the tremendous potentialities of South America. For example, 1 of the 20 Latin American republics alone has an area larger than that of continental United States. That republic is Brazil, which has a population of 45,000,000.

I have recently had the good fortune of receiving firsthand from a young and talented Brazilian, M. Pio Correa, Jr., a vast amount of information concerning this interesting country of Brazil. It appears that this country is rich in radioactive minerals, nickel ore, rubber, precious stones, bauxite ore, mineral oil, vegetable oil, fibers, and a host of other products which should be of importance to our industrial and economic life.

Among the other 19 Latin American republics we find Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Peru, Colombia, and Venezuela, with a combined population equal to that of Brazil and with products that possibly will likewise fit into our economic and industrial life.

Here at our very doorstep are 100,000,000 potential customers, who, if given the opportunity, will buy our products instead of those of Europe, and who will thus give employment to our millions of unemployed.

A joint congressional committee is the proper body to delve into all the matters pertaining to Latin America, and when the question of passage of this resolution comes before this House, as I trust it will in the opening days of the next session, I will again address this House with more and complete facts and figures pertaining to our Latin American friends and neighbors. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD following the speech of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] on the subject he and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] have discussed here this morning, and to include a speech I previously made in the House of Representatives which gives certain facts and figures.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER]?

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUNN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of unjust criticism comes quite often from some Members of the House against President Roosevelt because he has not as yet balanced the Budget. When Mr. Roosevelt took office hundreds of thousands of men and women in the United States were on the verge of starvation; thousands of banks had failed and thousands of unfortunate human beings who had placed their money in those banks could not get it back. Since Mr. Roosevelt has been in office we do not hear of people starving to death. When they put their money in the bank today they know it is safe. President Roosevelt may not have been able to balance the Budget, but he did one thing—he balanced the people's stomachs with good, substantial food. He also would have accomplished a great deal more if the majority of the Members of Congress would have supported his legislation. As long as the President is doing his utmost to provide the necessities of life for the people who are out of employment and others who cannot work because of physical disabilities the Budget, in my opinion, being well balanced. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOUSTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEYER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address I delivered on Labor Day at Milwaukee before the National Association of Letter Carriers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

OUR DUTY AS MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 4 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in a short time, either today or tomorrow, the Congress as a whole will have definitely decided the particular road which, in the opinion of the majority of the Members, is the road America will take in attempting to steer our ship of state through the difficult waters of present international affairs. I shall vote in favor of the conference report, including as, of course, it will the repeal of the embargo as well as the other provisions designed to prevent our involvement. As one Member who voted yesterday to instruct the House conferees to retain an arms embargo along with the other important provisions of the Senate bill, may I say that from now on it is, in my opinion, my duty and the duty of every single person to work along the lines that have been determined by the majority and to try to carry out the task which everyone has said was his task, namely, the task of keeping this Nation out of war. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, may I say, first, that I do not believe Members of this House who voted yesterday against instructing the conferees, cast their votes yesterday because they wanted to help the munition makers. I do not believe any Member of this House would do that. But we must guard against the consequences of our action. I have here, however, figures on the profits of various corporations for the last quarter of this year, which show conclusively to me that unless we pass effective excess-profits legislation we are going to have a serious dislocation of our domestic economy in favor of the munitions industry and against our normal peacetime industries. United States Steel, for example, made a net profit of \$10,420,000 for the third quarter of this year and still there is talk of further price rises. Other steel, aircraft, and similar corporations showed very great advances in profits. Du Pont profits for the first 9 months of 1938 were \$31,000,000; for the first 9 months of 1939 they were \$62,000,000. This all took place before repeal. Hence, after repeal excess-profits taxation becomes more than ever necessary.

I believe it is almost certain that the purchases of the Allied nations and anyone else engaged in war who buy from us are going to be more and more weighted on the side of munitions and less on the side of the things which they would normally buy. We must put into effect at once measures to maintain a decent opportunity for our peacetime industries and to combat unemployment in them.

It is most important that we concern ourselves about the solution of our domestic problems. I am not going to elaborate upon that matter. I think there are certain adjustments in our W. P. A. that need making, and I think it is most important that every one of us should be careful to protect the rights of labor, as well as the rights of civil liberties. One matter brought especially to my attention is the refusal up to this time of the Consolidated Steel Co. to bargain with the Metal Trades Council of organized labor in Los Angeles. For the company to take this attitude after the American Federation of Labor put forth such great effort to secure a fair share of shipbuilding business for southern California seems to me hard to understand. This is one example of what may happen. I think, further, it is necessary that we solve our unemployment problem and our agricultural problem. It is necessary that we spend most of our energy in those directions. And I believe it is important in the days that lie ahead for us to have the best understanding we can possibly obtain of the attitude and problems not only of all groups of the people of our own Nation but of the problems and attitudes of all the nations in the world. Each of us inevitably has deep convictions about all these things. Peace may depend on our understanding other people's convictions.

I appeal to you today primarily for unity of our own efforts and secondly for an earnest approach to our domestic problems, out of which, in my opinion, will come the best protection against the possible involvement of this Nation in war.

Finally, I believe, as I have already said, that this Nation should attempt to spread understanding throughout the world, that at all times and in all places our influence

should be thrown wherever we can most effectively throw it for the speediest possible conclusion of these hostilities on the basis of just and lasting peace.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the gentleman has made a very constructive suggestion. I wonder if he noticed this morning that evidence of this maladjustment has already been given by the announcement in the United Press report that England's purchases from the United States would from now on be shifted from agricultural products to war machines?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman very much. I think that is a very important problem to consider and to act promptly upon. But I want to make it plain I do not believe any Member of the House who voted against instructing the conferees for the embargo, as I might nearly did myself, cast that vote because he wanted that situation to obtain. The situation does obtain, however, as the gentleman and myself have tried to point out, and we must act upon it.

I shall vote for the bill even though it contains no embargo because I believe it contains provisions which will safeguard America against involvement in this war—either because of outstanding debts, the destruction of shipping, or loss of American lives.

I voted to instruct the conferees to insist upon keeping the embargo on arms and ammunition. I did this because I know the munitions traffic is wrong. I did this because I found it one way—the only way open to me at the time to attempt to guard against an unhealthy and certainly disastrous munitions trade boom in the United States. We will sell more munitions and less fruit, less machinery, less of all peacetime goods. I voted for this embargo because I know the munitions traffic is wrong and because I dread to see our country make profits by the sale of weapons to other nations when we ourselves are determined to keep out of war. The very profits of such a trade, I am afraid, may prove a most powerful force drawing us toward war. I hope the profits can be controlled. I hope I will be mistaken in my fears. I hope that the forceful arguments of those who have said that lifting the embargo was the road to peace will prove to be true.

Had the embargo been retained in our legislation, I should have been ready to repeal it at any time with regard to any nation whose civilian population was attacked by enemy airplane bombing.

The greatest services we can now perform for freedom and democracy are three: First, to solve our problem of unemployment and to solve it with fundamental measures that will be lasting and not by means of allowing a war trade boom to develop; second, to work unceasingly for peace as soon as possible and on the most fair and just possible terms to all, including Germany; third, to work among the neutral nations to develop now a formula for decent settlement of the problems of the nations and for a lasting peace.

The greatest services we can perform for England and France are to promote the earliest possible peace and to demonstrate that a democracy can conquer the problem of unemployment.

Our immediate tasks are those I have mentioned plus the one most necessary task without which we can accomplish none of the others. That one most necessary task is to keep our heads, to refuse to be swept off our feet by propaganda, to keep our Nation herself at peace. This we can do if we have the will to do it and if we keep very busy at the jobs I have outlined. But it will not be easy.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, on October 27 the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], under special order of the House, had the floor. I asked the gentleman from Michigan this question:

Does not the gentleman think it is about time that even Members of Congress restrain themselves as purveyors of hate?

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has been changed to read, "purveyors of false information," and the answer has been changed to read "purveyors of false information." Is this correct procedure? Does a Member have a right to change the form and the substance of a question and the form and substance of an answer in the RECORD?

The SPEAKER. The rule is that no Member has the right to change a statement made by his adversary in debate without the consent of the gentleman who made the statement. As far as was stated by the gentleman from Michigan, the Chair does not know who made the alleged change. Therefore the Chair can only state the general rule.

Mr. HOOK. The change was made without my consent and without my knowledge.

The SPEAKER. Of course, the Chair has seen no transcript of the reporter's notes and has not seen the copy of the speech with the alleged changes, so, as the Chair stated, he can reply to the inquiry only by stating the general rule.

Mr. HOOK. Then the procedure is to obtain the transcript of the reporter's notes and determine who made the change?

The SPEAKER. That would be a preliminary inquiry. The gentleman could submit a unanimous-consent request to have the language in the permanent RECORD corrected now.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be so corrected.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, not seeing on the floor the gentleman from Michigan who is involved in this matter, I would ask the gentleman to withdraw his request at this time; otherwise I shall be obliged to object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests that the gentleman from Michigan should be present.

Mr. HOOK. I withdraw my request, Mr. Speaker, and shall wait until the gentleman from Michigan is on the floor.

ARMS AND MUNITIONS TRADE WITH ENGLAND AND FRANCE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask how much the United States is willing to pay for the arms and munitions trade with England and France.

Last evening I was amazed to learn from a United Press dispatch, London date line, November 2, written by their staff correspondent, Henry T. Gorrell, that the revision of the United States arms embargo law, while opening the way for large British arms and munitions purchases, was expected to lead to a drastic curtailment of imports from the United States. Mr. Gorrell writes as follows:

One authoritative source estimated that British imports of certain American industrial products and foodstuffs would fall off as much as \$150,000,000 a year.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, if our country is willing to pay this price in order that we may sell arms and ammunition to belligerent nations. This writer contends that the purchase of war supplies from the United States would be greatly offset by a curtailment of imports of nonessential industrial and agricultural products. It is his contention that this curtailment is necessary in order to protect the exchange and permit the unlimited purchase of arms and ammunition.

It is very interesting to note in Mr. Gorrell's article that he specifically writes as follows:

The effect of the reduction of imports from the United States undoubtedly will be felt keenly over widespread areas of New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Michigan, the grain belts of the Middle West, the tobacco districts of the South, and the fruit zones of Florida and California.

The motion-picture industry stands to lose at least \$30,000,000 a year. The automobile industry, which usually amounts to about \$12,000,000 a year, is already at a standstill. British agents are reported to have ceased attending tobacco

auctions, and we do, annually, a tobacco business with the British Isles of \$85,000,000. Fresh fruit, farm machinery, wheat, livestock products, and most all products which might be listed as nonessential will give way to the exportation of arms and ammunition.

Again I ask, Mr. Speaker, is it worth the cost? [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article appearing in the Washington Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

CONGRESS SHOULD STAY IN SESSION

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, now that the arms embargo has been lifted we must make doubly certain that America will remain at peace. Congress should stay in session as long as the crisis in Europe and a war emergency exists.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. KELLER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what is the reason for making the request?

Mr. THILL. The American people do not trust the President in the White House. I have received hundreds of letters—and I have them in my office—which will show the gentleman definitely that the American people do not trust this administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

TULSA UNIVERSITY VERSUS CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY FOOTBALL GAME

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that tomorrow at Catholic University will be played one of the best football games you will have an opportunity to see. It might be a relaxation from the events of the week to see this game. [Applause.] Tulsa University plays Catholic University. Confidentially, if you want to place a little bet on Tulsa, you will be perfectly safe in doing so. If you will take a look at the team in the gallery, you will realize that my advice is good.

Mr. KELLER. Does the gentleman take any responsibility on that?

Mr. DISNEY. I will accept the responsibility on that. I am going to place a little money myself. [Laughter and applause.]

In all seriousness, you will see one of the best forward passers it has ever been my privilege to see.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Oklahoma that it is contrary to the rules of the House for Members to introduce occupants of the gallery. I am sure that the rule was not in the mind of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I did not introduce them. I just noted their presence.

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls attention to the fact because it is contrary to the rules of the House. Of course, we are all glad to have these fine young gentlemen present.

THE TREASURY STATEMENT

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 4 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to depart from the seriousness of the last few days and try to support, if I may, in a few words, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. RICH].

We had a debt after the war of some \$26,000,000,000. About \$3,000,000,000 was paid off from the sale of goods on hand, and not such a large amount as the gentleman from Mississippi indicated.

The abuse that Mr. Mellon drew from the minority during those days was great. Real enjoyment on the part of the minority was had at his expense. He went quietly on and reduced taxes and also greatly reduced the debt; and by reducing the taxes he encouraged business, released capital, and made it possible to reduce the debt. But still there lingers on the old enjoyment had at the expense of Mr. Mellon, while the present huge debt brings woe and worry even to those who are now still carping at him.

So, as a matter of illustration, I happened to think that I might quote—

There was a daschund once so long
He hadn't any notion
How long it took to notify
His tail of his emotion
And so it happened that while his eyes
Were filled with woe and sadness,
His little tail went wagging on,
Because of previous gladness.

[Laughter and applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests to submit.

Mr. Speaker, the first is to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD a complete report of the proceedings held on October 18, in the afternoon, at the chapel at Bowdoin College, in Brunswick, Maine, in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Brackett Reed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, the other request is that I have unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein certain excerpts from the speeches of the President with reference to the subject of unemployment, and also certain excerpts with reference to an interview which was given by Thomas Edison and Henry Ford in 1921.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

THE TREASURY STATEMENT

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of the RECORD I wish to make a correction in the statement made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] with reference to the amount of money available from the sale of surplus war supplies, and so forth, which was applied to the war debt.

If you will turn to page 612 of the 1930 Annual Treasury Report you will note the receipts from the sale of surplus war supplies, and so forth, is given as \$4,483,046,569.99. This, however, includes \$2,391,518,141.97 principal and interest on foreign obligations. The difference between these two amounts represents the amount available from the sale of surplus war supplies that was applied to the war debt. That was \$2,091,528,428.02.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who consider the national debt to be of the gravest importance, and I hope that when we come back in January we will all take that view.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein

a short editorial from the Oregon Sunday Journal of October 29.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKELOSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter received from Canada.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point and to include therein two news articles on the matter of our foreign trade in arms and agricultural products, appearing in this morning's paper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the parade of war orders is already under way and no one knows yet the volume they may attain nor the effect of the rapid expansion that will be needed to fill these orders and at the same time bring our own defenses up to date, nor has much thought been given to the final day of reckoning when these orders come abruptly to a halt following hostilities. Some of us have not yet forgotten the expansion of the World War days and the recession and collapse following soon thereafter.

The daily papers of Friday morning, November 3, announce that a flood of European war orders which administration headquarters expect will total a billion dollars in the next few weeks, will be released by the repeal of the arms embargo. I quote from an Associated Press article by Edward E. Bomar in this morning's Washington Post:

EMBARGO'S END TO FREE BILLIONS FOR ARMS HERE—BRITISH WANT 4,000 PLANES; FRANCE, 3,800; OTHER EXPORTS TO SUFFER

(By Edward E. Bomar)

A flood of European war orders, which administration quarters expect will total a billion dollars in the next few weeks, will be released by repeal of the arms embargo.

Even before the House action yesterday, a French purchasing mission contracted for 4,600 aircraft motors from two eastern manufacturers at a price of approximately \$50,000,000, officials were informed. A British mission, meanwhile, has been negotiating for some 1,600 training planes.

The arms embargo halted delivery on some 600 aircraft early in September. In addition to these, the French contemplate purchases of some 3,800 planes and the British 4,000, it was reported authoritatively. A Swedish mission has been negotiating for upward of 250 aircraft and a Belgian mission for 200.

The British-French Allies have stressed their need for war planes of all types, but their purchases are expected to cover a wide range of other products, including:

Motortrucks and motorcycles, clothing, machine tools, field ranges, explosives, foodstuffs, surgical instruments, hospital supplies, searchlights, gas masks, pontoon equipment, water-purifying units, ambulances, tents, saddles, telephones, and radio compasses.

An immediate effect of repeal of the embargo will be to permit delivery of some 300 war planes for Britain and France which have been completed since the embargo was imposed.

Presumably, it will mean immediate reinstatement of export licenses for planes and other munitions, which were canceled. The impounded orders were valued at \$14,680,807 for Great Britain and \$58,205,739 for France.

Thus far the British and French purchases apparently have not been coordinated as were the Allied purchases toward the end of the 1914-18 war, but measures to avoid competition between the two buyers are anticipated shortly.

A British purchasing mission headed by Lt. Col. J. H. M. Greenly, an official of the British industrial firm of Babcock & Wilcox, Ltd., has been at Montreal, but is expected to transfer its principal activities to New York.

While Congress debated the neutrality issue, the British appeared to be withholding purchases, but France's representatives are known to have placed quietly many orders whose fulfillment was subject to repeal of the embargo.

Most of the foreign orders are welcomed officially as an aid to American national defense. It is pointed out that they will mean expansion of industry's capacity to produce munitions of all kinds. Aircraft industry officials have insisted that American plants could handle the additional contracts even though they are turning out more than 4,000 planes for the Army and Navy.

American military orders have priority over foreign contracts, and the Army and Navy are in a position to exercise direct control through the licensing system of the State Department.

The United Press makes an announcement from London dated November 2 that should be of great interest to the farmers of America at this particular time in view of the record corn crop now being harvested, and I quote herewith an article appearing in the Washington Post for Friday, November 3:

OTHER EXPORTS TO SUFFER

LONDON, November 2.—Revision of the United States arms embargo, while opening the way for large British arms and munitions purchases, was expected tonight to lead to a drastic curtailment of British imports from the United States, such as industrial and agricultural products.

One authoritative source estimated that British imports of certain American industrial products and foodstuffs may fall off as much as \$150,000,000 a year.

Importers of American products said Britain's anticipated heavy purchases of war supplies from the United States would be offset "to a substantial degree" by curtailing imports of nonessential industrial and agricultural products, to protect exchange and permit purchase of arms and munitions.

The transportation of many American commodities, including tobacco, automobiles, women's apparel, shoes, hosiery, dried fruits, and barley already has been reduced drastically since the outbreak of the war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, entitled "Challenge to America."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

OPPORTUNITY FOR YOUTH IN AMERICA

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 4 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, since the gentleman preceding me has just announced something about a football game this afternoon, I call attention to the fact that this afternoon a national corn-husking contest is being carried on in the State of Kansas; and if you gentlemen will listen to the radio, you will hear the boys from Pennsylvania going down the long rows of corn, and, bump, bump, bump, at the rate of 45 ears to the minute.

Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a copy of a letter from Aubrey Williams to myself inserted in the RECORD yesterday by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], in which he asks me to make a public statement relative to some statement I made in Pennsylvania recently, in which I quoted him as saying that youth had no opportunity in Pennsylvania or in this country any more. Youth must have had an opportunity, because there must have been an opportunity for Aubrey when he stepped into a \$10,000 job, and there are other like jobs in America. He resents the fact that I said his talk over there when he threw a wet blanket on youth sounded like a "red," and he wants me to refute that statement. My answer is that whether he is a "red" or not, to me he is as "red" as a York County barn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an address that I delivered on the inauguration of the second president of Brooklyn College.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Also a second request, Mr. Speaker, to extend my remarks at a subsequent time on the subject of the fatality of folk lore.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include two letters written by Col. Theodore Roosevelt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EFFECT OF REPEAL OF ARMS EMBARGO ON THE ORIENT

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under the rule under which we have been operating during the consideration of this resolution, it has been very difficult for any Member of the House to obtain the floor long enough to openly discuss this situation. I call the attention of the House at this time to the probability that the repeal of the arms embargo may have a very adverse effect on the oriental situation. When we repeal the arms embargo for the purpose of correcting a certain situation in Europe, are we not also at the same time complicating, from our standpoint, a situation in the Orient? When we lift the arms embargo I do not see how we are going to help furnishing Japan with all of the materials that she will need for her evil purposes. Japan will be entirely free then to declare war on China and to declare a blockade of the China coast.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. Just one moment, please. I have offered certain suggestions to the conferees, which they probably will not take, that might save that situation.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a certain article entitled "America in the Key Position," by Kurt Bloch, from the magazine Asia and to now read the last paragraph from that article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. The paragraph to which I particularly refer is, as follows:

Thus the United States emerges as the decisive factor on the Far Eastern stage, with divided counsel. With public interest centered upon the war in Europe, the Far East may well for a while be pushed into the background of public discussion, but it is unlikely that it could easily be merged with other subconscious matter. By its own diplomacy and by the course of events, the United States has been forced into the ambiguous position of being "China's best friend" and the sole supplier of goods vital for Japan's conquest of China. Twenty years ago a similar ambiguity was overcome by the Lansing-Ishii agreement. Today Japan has gone so far beyond the limits of her treaty obligations toward the United States and China that it would seem impossible to find a similar way out of the Japanese-American difficulties and contradictions. The United States has no alternative but either actively to assist in the establishment of a Japanese new order in east Asia or to fight it by such measures as American legislation and American economic strength may supply.

The article in full is as follows:

[From Asia for November 1939]

AMERICA IN THE KEY POSITION

(By Kurt Bloch)

Victim No. 1 of the Soviet-German nonaggression pact of August 1939 was the Republic of Poland. Victim No. 2 may well be Japan, although it is too early as yet to foresee how serious the wounds caused by the splinters of the Soviet-German bombshell really will turn out to be.

Despite the local truce put into effect on the border of outer Mongolia, a comprehensive settlement of Soviet-Japanese friction would seem to have grown even more difficult than hitherto, because the Sino-Soviet relationship has been greatly modified through the outbreak of war in central and western Europe. Up till now the assistance granted by the Soviet Union to China was additional to and complementary with aid given by other powers, though the Soviet Union has granted China far more liberal aid than anybody else, with the sole exception of the United States Treasury under its silver-purchase program. Now, shortly after the conclusion of a new Sino-Soviet trade and credit agreement providing for no less than 700,000,000 rubles of Russian loans—possibly equivalent to about \$100,000,000—this assistance by the Soviet has gained new importance, since Europe's powers are straining their resources for their own war nearer home.

China, indeed, has lost much valuable support through the outbreak of war in Europe. Both Britain and France had agreed in principle to lend their aid to vast development schemes in China's southwest. Sino-French railway projects for Kwangsi and Yunnan had reached an advanced stage, with French loans seemingly securing their early completion. Another important railway was to be

built with British assistance to supplement the Yunnan-Burma Road. Both these projects may be considered as shelved indefinitely unless Soviet or American funds and materials can somehow be mobilized to replace Anglo-French aid, which will scarcely be forthcoming now.

Thus the Chungking Government is forced to rely well-nigh exclusively on Soviet assistance—if the Soviet Union will continue its help for China. To make sure of the Soviet's stand, China's leading Communist statesman, Chou En-lai has flown to Moscow. At the same time a new government crisis is shaking the Chungking Government. Even after the self-elimination of Wang Ching-wei quite a few important and influential members of the Chungking Government have continued to look askance at the Communist-Kuomintang alliance and to consider it rather as a truce than as a lasting "popular front." Though Soviet assistance was welcome to them, they were wondering whether the ultimate price for such aid—even at deferred payments—might not be too high and of a kind which they would thoroughly dislike. Recent evidence on ruthless anti-Communist activities of Chungking-appointed Chinese officials, even on the front behind the Japanese lines, and the general character of the leading Kuomintang personnel disclose that the popular front in China may be neither permanent nor unshakable. If the leaders of the U. S. S. R. should decide to make peace with Japan at China's expense, their apology might well be based upon this frailty at the foundation of China's resistance.

The replacement of Dr. H. H. Kung, Wang Ching-wei's successor as leader of China's peace group, by Dr. T. V. Soong is an attempt to remove ambiguity from China's domestic scene. Whether this can be done successfully is, however, rather doubtful. Dr. Kung is the one member of China's new "Soong dynasty" closest to China's big financial and business interests. His exit would seem to indicate that, in these circles, hopes of wartime commerce and its profits are running high, even though they may have to be shared with the Japanese invaders. The memory of World War profiteering is scarcely less strong in China than in Japan. In both countries, however, the present war between them has weakened, if not destroyed, the ability to produce for foreign markets profitably. Peace now would promise much more than its normal blessings. Once an end were put to Sino-Japanese hostilities, a new career of international wartime profiteering would be open to both of them.

China's military leaders, who in more than 2 years of war have developed a patriotism formerly unknown to many of them, are facing this domestic opposition of big business; and it seems as if they had decided to maintain their politico-military alliance with the Communist forces and the Popular Front. Their ability to cling to their resolve, however, depends on the decisions of Moscow. If the Soviet Union should decide to abandon China's cause, that cause may be lost.

There have been indications that the basis of Soviet policy now is a strong anti-British drive. From its earliest days, Marxism has considered Great Britain as the archenemy of democracy are freedom. The secret of Stalin's policy might turn out to be his determination to fight the British Empire to the last German and Japanese soldiers. If this were the Soviet game, China's chances for survival as a unified, independent country would, indeed, be slim.

Japanese military moves might be taken to foreshadow such a trend of events in the Far East. Next in importance to the truce on the Khalka River ranks the unification of the military command of the Japanese forces in China. This will doubtless soon be followed by the unification of civil administration in the various territories now subject to the combined Japanese authority. Wang Ching-wei's aspirations to form a new central government for all of China, claiming authority even in "free China," may now be fulfilled quickly. Such a step might very well result in the elimination from the various Japanese provisional governments of the bulk of the present personnel taken from the ranks of old imperial officials, in order to provide Wang with vast patronage opportunities to gain new adherence for his cause.

If Soviet support should be withdrawn from China, and Japan should prove ready to assume the function of a Soviet sword bearer against the British Empire, a subtle change in Japanese policy under the first impact of the German-Soviet pact might well prove to be transient only. But it is noteworthy that in September anti-British demonstrations in China and Japan were dropped, and Japan's threatening attitude against the Shanghai Municipal Council and foreign garrisons was replaced by a more accommodating attitude. Semiofficially, it has been hinted in Tokyo that this change was due to pressure by the United States Government. This would seem to disclose an understanding in Tokyo of the new accretion of strength to the American position as a result of events in Europe and of Japan's diplomatic isolation.

When the United States, in July, denounced the Japanese-American trade agreement of 1911, the official explanation of this step described this agreement as incompatible with the new American trade policy initiated, in 1934, with the Trade Agreements Act, and gradually developed in the Hull trade agreements with various nations. The legislative conditions under which the United States Government made this decision, however, were rather unequivocal; little doubt was left that the real intention of the United States, in denouncing the trade agreement, was to pave the way toward punitive economic action against Japan. In Japan itself the American move was understood to imply just such a threat.

The Japanese answer was the announcement of a new German-Japanese commercial agreement which, it was said, would secure to Japan vital supplies sufficient in peace and war. While the text of this German-Japanese agreement has never been disclosed, it may now safely be said that, for the duration of the European war, it will

be practically impossible to implement its terms. Moreover, some critical students of the embargo problem—insofar as it was hoped by an embargo to prevent Japanese war supplies from reaching her islands—rightly pointed out that action taken against export of such supplies to Japan could probably be nullified by German entrepôt business in commodities to which Japan was refused direct access. Now this possibility has vanished, and the British blockade would seem to leave little room for entrepôt business anywhere. This possibility of alternative supplies having vanished, Japanese dependence on American manufacturers and suppliers has greatly increased. Now, for the first time, an embargo on American exports to Japan, advocated by so many, might be developed successfully into a suitable instrument of peaceful compulsion.

Already Japanese equipment orders originally intended for Germany are being switched to the United States. However, American terms for Japan are still cash terms, while Germany since 1937 has been offering credit. Therefore it is likely that in the near future Japanese propaganda will try to influence American public opinion in favor of Japan's case. The more American supplies and American loans are needed by Japan, the more will such Japanese propaganda be intensified. Moreover, American interests, finding easier access to a widening market, will probably advocate friendlier relations with Japan.

It remains to be seen what conclusions the United States Government will arrive at in January 1940, when the trade agreement of 1911 expires and legal obstacles to punitive economic action against Japan are removed. Although public interest in the Far East has been visibly flagging, with war news from Europe making the headlines, this can scarcely be taken to indicate that public sentiment in the United States has grown more friendly toward Japan's case, especially since no change has taken place in the Japanese methods of warfare.

Unless the Soviet Union were to abandon assistance for China, the sheer force of economic circumstances resulting from the European war might succeed in pitting Soviet supplies for China against American supplies for Japan. Such a curious situation could scarcely last for any length of time with American popular sympathies on the side of China. It would certainly drive the embargo issue to the forefront of American politics during the January session of Congress.

It must be considered, accordingly, as more than a vague possibility that Soviet and American policy may be meeting in common cause on the battlefields of China. Preoccupation with the events in Europe and comprehensible resentment against the part played by the Soviet Union need not necessarily prevent more or less direct Soviet-American cooperation in far eastern diplomacy.

While these perspectives would seem to be the foremost results of the situation created in the Far East by the European war, it is a moot question how European hostilities may affect the British and French relations with the belligerents in eastern Asia. Britain's Ambassador in Chungking has already asserted that British friendship with China was not shaken by the events in Europe, and the personnel changes in the London Cabinet would scarcely suggest that the United Kingdom could now follow a course leading to a far eastern Munich.

Indirectly, the newly arisen need for Japan to seek an understanding with the United States, to secure supplies vital to Japan's economic life, may well redound to the advantage of the British Empire and its nationals in the Far East. As recent diplomatic history has proved, Japan could scarcely hurt Britain and British interests in the Far East without simultaneously violating American rights and interests. The parallelism of Anglo-American notes of protest has been due not only to diplomatic arrangements but also to actual identity of Anglo-American interests. Moreover, paradoxically, war in Europe will, to some extent, actually strengthen the British Empire in the Far East. Once more, the empire has been subjected to the concentric and galvanizing influence of united cooperation in war, and the British Dominions and possessions in the Pacific area have been put on a war footing. India's resources and India's military strength, especially in manpower, are once more at the disposal of the paramount power. From a purely military point of view, anti-British policies in the Far East have now become more risky than they were before the outbreak of war in Europe.

In addition, Japan may now hope to start a successful commercial drive on British Empire markets, though the spectacular developments of 1914-18—when Japan was Britain's ally—will scarcely be repeated, with the tendency toward industrialization within the empire and toward imperial autarchy so much more highly developed than 25 years ago. With export markets sorely needed by Japan, the hope for increased trade with the British Empire may well result in sharply decreased anti-British activities wherever Japanese influence extends.

On the whole, the same holds true of the French Pacific Empire, the Franco-British alliance having been extended to the Far East months ago. French military resources in the neighborhood of the Sino-Japanese theater of war constitute the vanguard of the joint Franco-British forces in the Far East.

To any anti-British and anti-French policies, there is today offered a strong military defense. With Japan undoubtedly able to exercise a large measure of naval control, her vulnerability on land today would constitute her greatest weakness, in the event that she were ready to play her part in the anti-British game which may possibly be the driving motive of the Kremlin.

If, however, Japan tries to realize the avowed primary aim of her policy, the subjection of China, it would seem she would have to make sure of lessened Soviet assistance to the Chungking gov-

ernment and of continued war supplies for herself from the United States. That Japan is conscious of the new importance of the United States in the far eastern line-up is clearly indicated by a minor detail in the personnel reshuffle which has taken place in Japan's diplomatic staff. One of the first results of the Soviet-German Pact and possibly of Italian neutrality in Europe's war, has been the recall of Japan's Ambassador in Rome, Toshio Shiratori, who has been among the protagonists of Japan's European diplomacy in the anti-Comintern bloc. Shiratori is going home via the United States, deeming it worth his while to study American far eastern diplomacy on the spot, and to find out for himself what action Japan may have to expect from the strongest naval power in the Pacific area. Moreover, diplomatic American-Japanese exchanges are proceeding in Washington, the precise objects of which have not been disclosed thus far.

Since Britain today is less likely to sponsor a far eastern Munich than is the Soviet Union, the attitude of the United States has now become of crucial importance for the future of the Far East. Suddenly, unexpectedly, and unwillingly, the United States is forced into the position of a monopolistic supplier of many of the most pressing needs of Japan's war economy. At the same time, Japan finds herself isolated diplomatically, and some of the most aggressive cliques and individuals have been discredited and eliminated from their key positions in Japan's Government. Japan is cutting her losses in a new deal with Outer Mongolia and still testing the uncertain ground of far eastern diplomacy.

In the new situation, the United States is faced with two—contradictory—elements in her own position. On the one hand, popular sentiment is still running high against the arch-aggressor nation of the Far East. Due to this trend of public opinion, the attitude of the United States could be clear-cut and unequivocal in principle, with the advocates of more concrete action against aggression looking scornfully down upon British weakness and hedging.

On the other hand, the large American interests in Japan and the growing attractiveness of the Japanese market are likely now to make themselves felt much more. American investment in, and American trade with, Japan has always been of far greater economic importance than the American stake in China. With Japanese orders and Japanese propaganda likely to increase in the vast American market, the fact should be kept in sight that present Japanese policies, in China and at home, threaten the present American stake in China and Japan with virtual destruction. In the long run, even the American interests in Japan will be served best by American action which would awaken Japan from her dreams of conquest to the realization of her own vital interests in peaceful cooperation with China and the West.

Thus, the United States emerges as the decisive actor on the Far Eastern stage, with divided counsel. With public interest centered upon the war in Europe, the Far East may well, for a while, be pushed into the background of public discussion; but it is unlikely that it could easily be merged with other sub-conscious matter. By its own diplomacy and by the course of events, the United States has been forced into the ambiguous position of being China's best friend and the sole supplier of goods vital for Japan's conquest of China. Twenty years ago a similar ambiguity was overcome by the Lansing-Ishii agreement. Today Japan has gone so far beyond the limits of her treaty obligations toward the United States and China that it would seem impossible to find a similar way out of the Japanese-American difficulties and contradictions. The United States has no alternative but either actively to assist in the establishment of a Japanese new order in East Asia or to fight it by such measures as American legislation and American economic strength may supply.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I offered an amendment to the motion to instruct the conferees of the House with respect to the extension of credits to belligerents by Government agencies. I know there was a great deal of discussion on the majority side of the House concerning the advisability of that. Many Members have advised me that they voted against the amendment because they were told it was redundant; that it was not necessary. I had called attention to the fact that the Federal Reserve banks which were organized by act of Congress, did not come within the inhibitions of the Johnson Act. As an interesting sequel to that, I am advised by long distance this morning from New York that the Federal Reserve banks have already been given the "Go" sign, in view of the action taken by the House yesterday, to furnish the credits by which belligerents may purchase war materials in this country.

Now, there is a great deal of discussion in the House at the present moment as to whether we should or should not remain in constant session. I have not been particularly enthusiastic about that. I did not see any particular neces-

sity for it, but if, as I am informed this morning, the Federal Reserve banks are going to furnish credits for the purpose of selling munitions to belligerents, I think it is our duty to ourselves and to our constituents to stay on the job as a check against any unneutral act by any of these Government agencies which do not come within the provisions of the Johnson Act and the Senate amendment. [Applause.]

I called attention to the fact that the word "person" did not include those agencies and that this amendment of mine was not redundant. Now we find that the agencies involved have themselves interpreted the bill to mean that they are not within its terms and limitations, and they are going ahead, in spite of the colloquy which took place in the Senate and in spite of the action taken by this House about furnishing these credits which may involve America in the European war. I believe in view of that, Mr. Speaker, that, unless we can correct that condition before we adjourn, this Congress should stay in session as a guard against dissipation of the taxpayers' money. [Applause.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I think the country should congratulate the gentleman upon his statement. If within 24 hours after Congress lifted the arms embargo, we are advised from Great Britain that Great Britain is going to transfer its purchases from agricultural products in this country to war munitions and we are also advised that the Federal Reserve Bank of this country is going to furnish credit, then Congress should stay in session and not be carried away by this propaganda which was so evident yesterday. [Applause.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. I believe the gentleman is correct, and I want to reiterate that I do not want to be a party—and I do not think any Member of this House wants to be a party—to the use of the taxpayers' money in financing any European conflict.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The action that has been taken by the Congress virtually commits us to one side in the war over in Europe. The gentleman cannot deny that?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I believe the gentleman is correct.

Mr. KNUTSON. We are selling to one side and not to the other, and the leadership on the majority side yesterday declared their sympathies with one side as against the other. The President has declared his sympathies for one side as against the other. We were neutral by law, but now we are not. We are definitely in it, and there is no doubt in my mind, if history repeats itself, that we will be in this war within 6 months, especially if the so-called Allies in the European war—I refuse to call it a world war unless we get into it—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman have 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan has made no request for additional time.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the revelations of the Dies committee have awakened the American people to the perilous menace of un-American activities in our country. This investigation has not only exposed serious subversive activities in the various arms of our national defense, but it has uncovered hundreds of Government civil employees who have membership in Communist-front organizations, or who have shown a tolerance or sympathy for such.

Think of it, Mr. Speaker! People on the public pay roll, paid out of the Federal Treasury, working under the shadow of the National Capitol, bearing allegiance to or sympathy for some foreign ideology.

Mr. Speaker, the work of the Dies committee, however, will be a useless expense and a futile gesture unless the Congress pass legislation to put an end to this disgraceful spectacle. [Applause.] When Congress meets in January legislation to end this stark travesty should be introduced and vigorously pressed to passage. Of course, it is the normal duty of this committee to propose such legislation, but, in view of the temper of the Seventy-sixth Congress resulting from the sensational exposures of the committee, I predict that such legislation will receive ready and enthusiastic support.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Dies committee has amply justified its creation. I think it has performed a most excellent public service, and I am willing to vote such additional appropriation as may be necessary to carry forward this work so vital and important to our national welfare. [Applause.]

Mr. PITTENGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. From what source does this opposition to the Dies committee come?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Of course, it emanates mainly from these un-American organizations, and I regret to say that some of it comes from certain people occupying high positions in our Government. If the gentleman will follow me, I think he will find an answer to his inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, for more than 16 years Congress has sought a solution for the economic and social problems of our country which are the direct outgrowth of inadequate legislation dealing with immigration. In the past 3 years there have been several attempts to correct some of the evils which are daily growing more apparent.

On June 10, 1937, this body, by voice vote, passed H. R. 6391, the Dies bill, for the deportation of criminal aliens. This bill never came to a vote in the Senate, but it helped to focus the attention of the people on our alien problem. This bill also drew the fire of some of the alien groups in our country, and by the fall of 1937 there had been set up in New York City an organization known as the American Committee for Protection of Foreign-Born, with headquarters at 100 Fifth Avenue. This committee, claiming to represent 155 organizations, with a membership estimated at 1,055,000 persons, has been particularly active since that time. Among their affiliated organizations were the Communist Party, New York State Committee, International Workers Order, American League for Peace and Democracy, Friends of the Soviet Union, International Labor Defense, National Maritime Union, Workers Alliance of Greater New York, and many other groups identified with the foreign "ism" movements in the United States. The only thing American about this committee was its name, but by January 1938 it was boasting of its victories in 1937. In his report for the year, Dwight C. Morgan, secretary, said:

We have won some victories with the forces we have been able to mobilize. We have been able to gain at least temporary refuge in the United States for Max Meister, a stowaway from Germany, who was held for exclusion at Ellis Island. We have been able, through Congressman Celler, to stay the deportation of Hans Goepel, another anti-Nazi refugee. We were able the other day to remove from Ellis Island, Paul List, who was wounded in Spain, and now faces deportation to Germany.

Now, I have mentioned this Committee for the Protection of the Foreign-Born to call attention to the fact that the foreign-born and aliens in our midst, over 4,000,000 in number, are being organized for a united fight against any change in our immigration laws that will, so far as they are concerned, work any hardships upon them. And by these hardships I include fingerprinting and other means of registering, which I believe we will ultimately have to adopt in dealing with this alien problem.

HOW MANY ALIENS IN THE UNITED STATES?

In the 120 years from 1820 to 1939, inclusive, 38,219,687 persons have emigrated to the United States. Of this number, as late as 1930, according to the census, there were 6,234,613 persons who owed their allegiance to another flag, living under the protection of the Stars and Stripes.

Today, according to the most conservative compilations, we still have 4,091,159 unnaturalized aliens in this country competing with our own citizens and those who have become citizens through the process of naturalization for jobs, for business, and, in many instances, for both public and private charity.

After 10 years of the world's greatest depression, this is a situation which cannot be lightly laughed aside. And the immigrants continue to pour in on almost every ship that arrives at an American port, but we know them now not as immigrants but as refugees. "Refugee" is an easy word that softens our hearts and lowers our guard. In fact, in the recent shaping of events it seems that these European refugees are of more concern to the New Deal than are the 10,000,000 of American refugees who have been walking the streets of our cities in vain for years seeking the economic security that was promised to them back in 1933 by President Roosevelt. But the American people are not to be deceived by this refugee bunk. This is just another scheme to bring additional thousands here who are not wanted in Europe. On October 24 last the Swedish-American liner *Drottningholm* arrived at New York with 579 passengers, of whom 279 were Americans. Among the aliens aboard were 93 Germans, mostly Jewish refugees. One was Daniel Sternberg, who conducted the symphony orchestra at Tiflis, Russia. Perhaps Mr. Sternberg will find Americans most receptive to his symphonies, but if I had my choice he would play them elsewhere.

WHO ARE OUR IMMIGRANTS?

Of the 82,998 quota immigrants admitted to the United States during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, the racial composition is as follows:

Hebrews.....	43,450
Italians.....	6,708
Germans.....	5,524
English.....	5,076
Irish.....	2,968
Scotch.....	1,968
Scandinavians.....	1,563
French.....	2,214
All others.....	13,525

Are these figures self-explanatory? Do they reveal a situation to our satisfaction?

Mr. Speaker, in 1929 a sincere effort was made to regulate our future immigration when President Hoover, by proclamation, put into effect the quota system. The total annual quota set for all nations was 153,774. These quotas were set according to a formula based upon previous immigration, and the national origin of the immigrants prior to 1920. Under the formula the quotas established for the countries of principal origin were as follows:

Great Britain and North Ireland.....	65,721
Germany.....	27,370
Irish Free State.....	17,853
Poland.....	6,524
Italy.....	5,802
Norway (2,377) and Sweden (3,314).....	5,691
Netherlands.....	3,153
France.....	3,086
Czechoslovakia.....	2,874
Soviet Union (Russia).....	2,712
Switzerland.....	1,707
Belgium.....	1,304
Denmark.....	1,181

The quotas for all other nations are below 1,000.

In studying the immigration records for the fiscal year 1939, one cannot help noticing the apparent disregard of all quota provisions on the part of the enforcement agencies of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, when we find that 30,096 Hebrews have been admitted from Germany during the past year, a number which alone exceeds the national quota by 2,726.

DEPORTATIONS FOR 1939

While 82,998 immigrant aliens entered the United States during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, our deportations for the year were the lowest of any in the last 10-year period.

Our deportation record, by years, is as follows:

1930.....	16,631
1931.....	18,142
1932.....	19,426
1933.....	19,865
1934.....	8,879
1935.....	8,319
1936.....	9,195
1937.....	8,829
1938.....	9,275
1939.....	8,202

Of the aliens deported in 1939 over 20 percent, or 1,638, were criminals; 1,056 had been previously deported; and 3,080 had entered this country without valid passports. Can we afford to allow the condition here revealed to remain unchallenged?

WHO WE DEPORTED

Of the aliens deported in the 5-year period from 1934 to 1938, inclusive, 3,216 were English, 2,598 Italian, 2,463 French, 1,770 Irish, 1,383 Scotch, 1,483 German, 998 Chinese, 850 Scandinavian, 740 Greek, 510 Hebrew, and 28,486 people of other nationalities.

CONTRACT LABOR IMMIGRANTS

Under the provisions of the Immigration Act of 1917, employers may file petitions to be allowed to import alien workmen into this country.

In 1938 petitions to the number of 1,581, involving 2,515 aliens, were filed by prospective employers. Favorable action was taken on 736 petitions involving 880 laborers.

During the fiscal year 1939 favorable action was taken on 772 petitions affecting approximately 800 additional workers.

Can anyone logically assume that these alien workmen were a necessity in our country at a time when more than 10,000,000 of our own people were unemployed?

WHO ARE OUR IMMIGRANTS?

To further illuminate this interesting subject, I now refer to Press Release No. 19, Department of State, dated January 19, 1939, entitled "Immigration Quotas, Vital Statistics" for the year ending June 30, 1938. From this official press release I glean the information that of the 45,712 quota immigration visas issued by American consular officers abroad for that year, but 52 visas were issued to persons listed as "farmers" coming to the United States. There were 29 from France, 19 from the Netherlands, and 2 each from Germany and Hungary. So the people who are coming here are not coming to farm but to crowd up in our cities and to compete with our own business, professional, and laboring men.

This situation, Mr. Speaker, would not be serious but for the fact that these aliens frequently are unable to keep up with the swift tempo of American life and easily fall into the habits of their native lands. They crowd into tenements and become dissatisfied with their new-found promised land. Then it is but a step until, in many instances, they fall victims to one or another subversive movement which holds out to them social and economic objectives attainable only through bloodshed and violence. Many of these disillusioned victims have already told their stories before the Dies Committee Investigating Un-American and Subversive Activities in the United States. I wish that every citizen could secure and read a complete set of the committee hearings. It would be well worth the price if the Office of Education could supply a complete set to every school in the Nation, so that the children and their parents might learn exactly what the foreign "ism" elements in this country are doing to wreck our Government and destroy our liberties.

THIRTY THOUSAND ALIENS ON RELIEF—THOUSANDS MORE IN INSTITUTIONS AND PRISONS

Mr. Speaker, through the courageous action of Congress last year, more than 30,000 aliens were removed from the rolls of the Works Progress Administration early this year, effecting a saving of over \$1,800,000 a month which was promptly made available for the relief of our own citizens, many of whom had long been denied the opportunity of public-works employment theretofore extended to the dis-

charged aliens. This was the logical and American way to deal with a most distasteful situation. The taxpayers of the Nation have too long been assuming burdens which normally should have been borne by others.

But there is another burden thrust upon us by the foreign-born and the aliens which we cannot escape. That is the burden of caring for the mentally defective, the insane, and the criminal alien element. Quite recently the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York has made a study of this phase of the immigration problem. In their publication *Conquest by Immigration* are found many interesting statistics. From them I have compiled the following tables showing the foreign-born inmates of mental and corrective institutions in the several States, and another list showing the alien-born prison population of certain States:

Foreign-born and aliens reported in institutions for mental defectives for 1938

Alabama.....	18
Arkansas.....	22
California.....	6,847
Colorado.....	756
Delaware.....	163
Idaho.....	94
Illinois.....	6,056
Indiana.....	525
Iowa.....	251
Kansas.....	271
Kentucky.....	25
Louisiana.....	33
Maryland.....	404
Massachusetts.....	1,596
Michigan.....	5,121
Minnesota.....	2,577
Mississippi.....	7
Nebraska.....	77
Nevada.....	20
New Jersey.....	2,043
New Mexico.....	8
New York.....	4,562
North Carolina.....	24
North Dakota.....	236
Ohio.....	1,328
Oklahoma.....	62
Oregon.....	353
Pennsylvania.....	824
Rhode Island.....	946
South Dakota.....	348
Tennessee.....	30
Texas.....	183
Virginia.....	14
Washington.....	784
West Virginia.....	92
Wisconsin.....	143
Wyoming.....	148

Foreign-born and aliens reported in penal institutions for 1938

California.....	851
Colorado.....	63
Connecticut.....	39
Delaware.....	124
Idaho.....	21
Illinois.....	196
Indiana.....	9
Iowa.....	40
Kansas.....	26
Maryland.....	99
Massachusetts.....	599
Michigan.....	686
Minnesota.....	12
Missouri.....	4
Nebraska.....	59
New York.....	946
Ohio.....	404
Washington.....	259
Wisconsin.....	69

THE FRIENDLY BORDERS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. Speaker, our country has long been known for its hospitality to the stranger who comes here for business or pleasure. We have, in fact, been the good neighbor to all countries, particularly to Canada and Mexico.

The records, for 1938, of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, show 52,993,989 individual entries into the ports of entry along our borders, including each individual crossing of the border by any United States citizen or traveling alien. Of this total, 14,230,131 were alien entries from Canada and 14,421,370 alien entries from Mexico.

Besides the alien entries there were 15,740,505 citizen entries from Canada and 8,601,983 from Mexico.

To check against this horde of visitors is one of the duties of the Immigration Border Patrol. In 1938 the border patrol apprehended 13,655 law violators, 112 of whom were smugglers of aliens, 12,851 illegal entrants were seized, as were 692 persons wanted for other law violations. How many got by the border patrol will never be known, but it is safe to assume that the number runs well into the thousands, for once an alien is across the border and in the hands of friends the possibility of being apprehended and deported is remote.

The border patrol, as an organization, is small but efficient. Its complement of 850 officers and men cannot be expected to perform the impossible feat of adequately patrolling thousands of miles of our border, day and night. To keep the aliens out we must have additional laws with teeth in them to help.

MISUSE OF PASSPORTS

The simplicity with which persons can enter or leave our country is aptly illustrated in the case of Grover Bergdoll, the draft dodger. From his own story told on the witness stand in his recent trial before a military court at Governors Island, N. Y., we learn that Bergdoll, tiring of life in Germany, made two successful trips back to the home of his mother in Philadelphia, entering the United States each time by way of Canada under an assumed name. All of which took place when Bergdoll was a fugitive from the United States authorities, and his photographs and fingerprints had been broadcast and posted throughout the Nation. There were undoubtedly many "Bergdolls" who crossed our borders in the last few years. But what I cannot help wondering is how many men more dangerous to America than Bergdoll have sneaked into the United States or gone to some foreign countries and back as Communist Earl Browder and Communist Fred E. Beal did on phony American passports prepared for them by friends who knew the ropes and strings to pull in New York to get them.

We need some additional safeguards also to prevent the fraudulent issuance of passports. While I have cited these two instances of the misuse of passports on the part of American citizens, from facts developed in the testimony before the Dies Committee Investigating Un-American Activities, it is generally conceded that there are in several of the European capitals well-organized passport rings who specialize in the business of providing fake passports for secret agents of the Communist Internationale to all countries, including ours.

MANY ALIEN SEAMEN JUMP SHIPS AT UNITED STATES PORTS

Mr. Speaker, another source of frequent trouble to our Immigration and Naturalization Service arises from the horde of foreign seamen entering our ports. Many of them, it is known, ship on boats sailing for America, with the intent and purpose of jumping ship when they get here. In the fiscal year 1938 alien seamen paid off and discharged in the United States ports numbered 21,875. In addition to this number there were 1,577 seamen who were removed to hospitals in this country, and 2,841 seamen deserted their ships. Thus, 26,293 alien seamen were dumped in the lap of America. They either had to find jobs on American or foreign ships or haunt our waterfronts in search of relief or work.

During the year, 24,539 of these seamen reshipped to foreign ports, but 1,754 alien seamen remained in this country at the end of the fiscal year, unaccounted for. From testimony before the Dies committee it is easy to understand just how many of these alien seamen may possibly have engaged in activities of a subversive nature. Many also possibly have been utilized in carrying on the intensive espionage maintained in this country by Communist and Nazi and Fascist groups in Europe.

Mr. Speaker, if we hope to preserve our free democracy as was handed down to us by an illustrious ancestry; if we mean to perpetuate our liberty, we must immediately take

steps to rid our land of these enemy aliens who are busily engaged in spreading the doctrines of hate and discontent, and who are boring from within, with a view to the final overthrow of our Government. It may require some painful surgery to remove this suppurating cancer, but as one Member of this body, I am willing and anxious to support any necessary legislation to accomplish the operation.

These disciples of foreign ideologies continually complain about our form of government. They want to change it to conform to the Nazi form, the Fascist form, or the Communist form. Well, Mr. Speaker, if they do not like our form of government, in the name of God, why do they not get out and go back whence they came. [Applause.]

I regret to say that in my judgment the one thing that has increased the audacity and improved the opportunities of these foreign emissaries to ply their nefarious programs has been the attitude of our national administration during the past 6 years. There has been a well-defined tendency on the part of our public officials to coddle these "reds" and parlor pinks. Along with hundreds of thousands of Americans, I was utterly amazed a few days ago when the President in one of his press conferences characterized as "sordid business" the action of the Dies committee in exposing Government employees who are either Communists or "fellow travelers." This rebuke by our Chief Executive of a congressional committee endeavoring to perform a patriotic service was indeed a melancholy commentary.

All praise to this committee for its courage, its independence, and its determination to stamp out this malignant curse to Americanism regardless of any influence that may be exerted from whatever source.

Mr. Speaker, the greatest menace to this country today does not come from abroad. Our greatest danger lies in the activities of these subversive influences, and the sooner we suppress them the better for our country—the last pure democracy on the face of the earth. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a speech made by our colleague, Hon. MARTIN J. KENNEDY.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NEUTRALITY

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that now that it is determined the way we are going on this neutrality action, the majority of this House, in fact, all Members of the House, are sincere and faithful in the pronouncements they have made during this entire debate in maintaining our national neutrality.

Statements made on the floor this morning, innocent as meant to be, may have a tendency to reflect the taking of sides in legislation, and I am sure that all those who voted as the majority voted yesterday did so feeling that this is truly neutral legislation and that we have not taken sides but the vote was merely to take care of our own American needs and security. After all, it is kind of like a lawyer making up his case. He goes before the judge and jury, tries it through the long process of court procedure, great briefs are filed by each side, and it is prolonged, perhaps, through days and days of trial and testimony, charging of the jury by the court after extended arguments to the jury by counsel; yet at the end when he sees that case, if it goes through and is reported in *Cyc* or *Corpus Juris*, he will find it covered by one simple sentence, just one little item that makes up the great body of *corpus juris*. This, in my opinion, is

the way this will turn out. I do not believe we should get exercised any more than to say that we feel it will uphold our neutrality as voted by both branches of the Congress, an action which expresses the feeling of this Nation.

I wish to ask the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] a question. He asked one a while ago and seems to be concerned about the position this country will be left in by this action as to shipments of war materials to Japan and China. As I understand it, we have already been shipping just what would be permitted under the law, as it presently is, to both China and Japan. I ask the gentleman from California what this bill as it now stands, with or without suggested changes that may be brought back by the conferees, will do to affect the situation? How does it affect America as far as selling to Japan and China is concerned? What danger is there?

Mr. HINSHAW. Answering the gentleman's question, Mr. Speaker, let me say that since the letter of the Secretary of State to various aircraft corporations no airplanes have been shipped to Japan. In the month of April, however, and I have the figures to support this statement, 124,000 tons of scrap iron went west-bound through the Panama Canal. If this bill is finally passed as it was when it went to conference there is no reason why Japan should not declare war on China and at the same time declare a blockade of China's coast. So far neither nation has been willing to declare war, perhaps in order to discourage the United States from proclaiming the embargo on war supplies. At the present time both nations are able to get some war supplies. After the embargo is repealed, however, only one will be able to get them. What are we going to do about that?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. It seems to me we are in no greatly changed position there. That, apparently, is only an incident. That is all those orientals admit it to be. There has never been any war declared between China and Japan; it is merely an incident.

Mr. HINSHAW. At least nobody in high places has found there is a war between Japan and China.

Mr. PATRICK. No; they tell us only that it is just an incident. Certainly no chief executive of a nation would want to insult other nations who are at peace by telling them they are at war. I do not see how it will make any difference at all in our dealings with these nations because it becomes merely an academic proposition with the embargo removed.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. With all due respect, may I not say that everyone here knows that the effect of this bill will be to help those countries having strong navies, and at the same time it harms the land powers, and it harms all of the small nations that do not have navies or vessels of commerce.

Mr. PATRICK. That, of course, is not a matter for us to decide. We cannot even decide who is a nation now, we do not even know who is a nation. All we can wisely undertake is to try to look after America.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman states that no war has been declared between Japan and China, that it is referred to over there as an incident. I wonder if the gentleman knows that a member of the British Cabinet on the floor of Parliament the other day referred to the European war as merely a crisis?

Mr. PATRICK. I do not know. I believe the gentleman from Mississippi will concede there are those better able to discuss that than either he or I. If we are smart, we shall leave that to someone else. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following letter, which was read by the Clerk:

NOVEMBER 3, 1939.

HON. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the following committees of the House of Representatives: Insular Affairs, World War Veterans' Legislation, Public Buildings and Grounds, Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress, and Elections No. 2.

Very sincerely,

BUTLER B. HARE.

The resignation was accepted.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following letter, which was read by the Clerk:

HON. WILLIAM BANKHEAD, *Speaker*.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and Claims, to be effective immediately.

Respectfully yours,

FRANK B. KEEFE.

The resignation was accepted.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to have unanimous consent to speak out of order for a few minutes.

There was no objection.

BIRTHDAY OF HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN

The SPEAKER. I have just discovered that this is the anniversary of an occasion that occurred in the State of Massachusetts some years ago which, in its sequence, has developed into the presence on this floor today of a very able, distinguished, and beloved Representative who occupies the position of minority leader of his party in the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN. [Applause, the Members rising.]

I do not propose to indulge in any fulsome flattery or undue praise with reference to the personal charms, ability, and popularity of our friend on the minority side, nor is it necessary for me to make any allusions as a Democrat to his skill as a political organizer [laughter], but it is a genuine pleasure to me, as I am sure to all of you, that this happy incident should be recalled in the presence of our friend, and I am sure that you all join with me in extending our felicitations and congratulations to him upon the return of this day.

I am not going to undertake to say how old he is, because he is still a very eligible bachelor, but, nevertheless, we are happy to pause for just a moment in the very serious deliberations of this body today to pay our tribute of admiration and affection for JOE MARTIN. Although he is a very modest man on all occasions, and somewhat shrinks from self-seized opportunities to make a speech, I am sure that we might have just a word from him. [Applause.]

MR. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker and colleagues on both sides of the House, one might easily conclude we have started adjournment proceedings. [Applause.] I might, if I were at all suspicious, question the good faith of the Speaker and conclude he was placing me in what is commonly called a "hot spot." But seriously, my colleagues, I do heartily appreciate the kind words of my old friend of years here in Congress and one for whom I have the highest admiration and most profound respect. I also appreciate the good will of the membership of the House on both sides of the aisle.

We come here as Members of a great legislative body. We have many different views. We have our differences, but I honestly believe everyone who sits in this House honestly strives to do his duty in a manner which he believes to be for the best interests of his constituency and for the country.

Personally, I know of no greater pleasure than to be a Member of this body. I am proud of my membership here. I could on several occasions have probably gone to what might be considered by others a higher place, but I preferred to stay here where I have enjoyed my service and so many warm friendships. I think membership in this body is the greatest opportunity for service that could be presented to any American; and I am delighted to serve under one whom I

believe is one of the fairest and most able Speakers who ever occupied that exalted chair. [Applause.]

I thank the membership of the House for its felicitations on this day, which, incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I try to forget, because as time goes on we do not care to recall birthdays quite so frequently. I appreciate this manifestation of good will, and from the bottom of my heart I express my warm thanks to the Speaker and to the Members of this House for their generous statements and expressions of friendship. [Applause.]

MR. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. If it is not out of order at this juncture, the Chair was about to announce a recess in honor of Mr. MARTIN's birthday. [Applause.]

MR. ROBSION of Kentucky rose.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has agreed to recognize the gentleman from Kentucky. For what purpose does he rise?

MR. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION]?

There was no objection.

MR. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I want you to know that I personally appreciate the very fine courtesy that you have shown to our Republican leader, Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts, in your timely remarks on this his birthday. Mr. MARTIN is a capable organizer, a wise leader, and a broad-minded statesman, and one of the finest and most gracious men in the House. Our Speaker is always eloquent, gracious, and fair. He has the respect and esteem of the Members on both sides of the aisle.

MR. SPEAKER, press reports indicate that the Federal Reserve Board and Federal Reserve banks, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and other Federal agencies take the position that the cash-and-carry provision of the neutrality bill does not apply to them. The people of the United States have labored under the belief that no credits could or would be extended to warring nations. They believed it was strictly a cash-and-carry bill. On yesterday I voted for the Wolcott amendment to make certain that the taxpayers' money of this country would not, through the Federal Reserve Board banks, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and other Federal agencies, be permitted to help finance another European war as we did between 1914 and 1918. [Applause.]

On today, or tomorrow, a motion will be made by the administration leaders to adjourn this Congress sine die. The Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion in their recent national conventions urged that Congress remain in session during the present emergency. Hundreds of other great organizations, and millions of American people joined in the plea of the veterans. Hundreds of letters which I have received from my district and State and throughout the country concerning the neutrality question have insisted that Congress remain in session. The Congress was called into extraordinary session on September 21, and it has now been engaged for more than 6 weeks in considering foreign affairs, matters in Europe, to repeal the embargo on arms and thereby aid France and England. Nothing has been done to solve our pressing domestic problems. We still have 10,000,000 unemployed, millions needing relief. Agriculture is in distress, thousands of business industries are closed down. Why not remain in session and devote our time to a solution of these great problems. Why should we not during the next 7 weeks before Christmas do something for the people on this side of the Atlantic?

Under the new neutrality bill many perplexing questions and many incidents might arise that may involve us in war. I think we can render great service to the country and to the administration to remain in session, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, if a motion is made to adjourn today or tomorrow I shall vote against that motion. [Applause.]

Many of those who voted yesterday to repeal the embargo in the hope that it would help the farmers of the Nation today see their hopes dashed to the ground. United Press carries a London dispatch to the effect that Great Britain will

withdraw \$150,000,000 that she planned to spend for agricultural products and will now use that money to buy munitions of war. England will get most of her agricultural products from her colonial possessions, South America, and other countries. England has already placed an order for 200,000 tons of beef with Argentina.

The press reports today indicate that our great bombing planes, shells, poison gas, flaming torches, and other death-dealing instruments are on the move. Millions and millions of dollars' worth of arms and munitions of war have been piled up in the hope that the embargo would be repealed. The munition makers of America have been busy in repealing the embargo. We, a great Christian Nation, are about to show to the world that we are the arsenal, munition makers, and brokers for France and England. We will furnish poison gas, flaming torches, and other instruments of death to destroy human lives and property. As the President said in 1936, we are in a mad race seeking "fool's gold and blood money." As Christians, we propose again to gather profits from the blood and tears of people across the seas in Europe and China. Believing that this in the end means war for our own people and cause us again to finance another European war and furnish our own blood and tears, I, for one shall fight and vote to keep this Congress in session until the regular session in January. Let us stay here and help to preserve peace and save democracy on this side of the Atlantic. [Applause.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, in the mail this morning I received an essay written by a 16-year-old girl from my home county seat, the city of Ashland. The story is woven around her home and the characters are her father and her brother, who is still in high school. This boy is like thousands of other boys who are filled with patriotism. All they think about is enlisting in some branch of the Army, preferably the Air Corps, and they think it is heroic to do this. I shall ask permission to include this essay in my remarks because it is a true story of what is being enacted in thousands of homes today. I believe if this father, who served during the World War, and was wounded in action, had talked to his son several years ago the boy would not have been so anxious to join the Army and go overseas; in fact, he wanted to enlist in the Canadian Air Corps. However, after his father talked to him when the boy made his wishes known, and told him what hell he and his comrades had to go through in the trenches, how they were trained to curse when they were in bayonet practice, using dummies that were representing the opposing forces, the Huns at that time, the boy changed his mind. If the father had talked to that boy about this several years ago it would never have entered his mind to enlist in the Army.

Mr. Speaker, this essay pictures this situation so vividly that I ask unanimous consent to include it in my remarks at this point in the RECORD, because I believe the story deals with a drama that is being enacted in thousands of American homes every day now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

WHY ONE AMERICAN BOY DIDN'T GO TO WAR

(By Alice Chapple)

When the subject turned to war at the supper table, Bill, a high-school senior, was almost feverishly excited. His eyes glistened, and he repeated descriptions he had read of the brutal bombing of civilians in Poland, and the last-minute war news that he had heard from London and Berlin over his father's short-wave radio. In fact, while the subject of discussion remained on war, Bill was vibrant, strangely agitated. During the rest of the meal he was silent, so silent it was noticeable by contrast, like a person daydreaming. But let another word be

dropped about the fighting in Europe, and Bill snapped into life again, almost as though he were electrically controlled, and he would babble on, monopolizing the conversation in a strange sort of fervor.

His father, scowling at him across the table, frankly didn't like it.

"You know it isn't our war," he said abruptly, almost sharply. "Why, John, he doesn't mean anything," spoke up mother, "Don't be so harsh with him."

But Bill, who sometimes winced under his father's tongue lashings, was oblivious to it this time. He rambled on about the western front, about Russia and Germany dividing up Poland, about the danger of Germany seizing Rumania unless somebody stopped Hitler.

Supper broke up, and mother retired to the kitchen to do the dishes. Bill followed his father into the living room, still babbling about the war.

Father, who had stooped over the smoking table to fill his pipe, swung around suddenly.

"For God's sake, Bill, cut it out! Drop it!" he ordered. "What's the war to you?"

There was a long silence.

"That's what I've been trying to tell you all day," Bill answered. "Yes; since yesterday—since 2 or 3 days ago."

The father, so stern a moment before, stiffened, and his face went white. He fought to control himself, but his throat went dry, and with an unnatural calm he forced out the words, "What's that?"

"Dad," Bill said, and his face suddenly became earnest and alive and beaming. "You know Canada's declared war. And Dad, they're opening an airplane school at Duluth for pilots and mechanics. And Tom and Joe and I have been talking. What would you think if we"—he hesitated, as if the words were painful—"if we—well, supposing Tom and Joe and I were to quit high school and go up to this Duluth school?"

The father was dead silent.

"That's not quite all," Bill continued. "You see, Tom and Joe and I figured if we put in a couple of months at this Duluth school we could—"; the boy broke off. Another long silence.

"Yes?" said the father finally.

"Well, hang it all, Dad," the boy answered, his voice a mixture of defiance and elation, "you might as well know the rest of it. We're figuring on going up to Port Arthur and enlist in the Royal Flying Corps."

Another long silence, broken by the boy.

"Now, don't you start telling me we can't do this, Dad; we've decided."

The father slowly put his pipe down on the table, with almost painful care, his fingers trembling just a little. Then he walked over to the writing desk, still without a word, and fumbled around in the back of one or two of the little pigeonhole drawers. He found what he was looking for after a moment.

"I'm not telling you anything," he said, his voice strained. "But sit down here a minute before your mother finishes the dishes."

"Do you see this little silver button? It's what I got out of the last war. I wore it for awhile, but over 15 years ago I took it off for the last time so I could forget the whole thing. I'm supposed to be proud that I can wear this button showing I was wounded in action, but I would give almost anything if I could forget that button and everything it means and never have another of those ugly nightmares that still torture me several times each year when the whole thing comes back to me."

"I was 18 then, and I enlisted to save the world for democracy. Get that—to save the world. You have had a feeling in church sometimes that we call religion. Well, this was the greatest religion that ever hit me. We were going out to actually save the world—this was the war to end all wars for all time to come. Can you think of a greater thing than that? A holier cause to dedicate yourself to?"

"Well, we did our bit—a lot of other fellows like myself. All with this great ideal. And now I have got to be brutally frank with you. In all the years since you've been born I have never talked to you like this, because I had hoped against hope that the world wouldn't get into this mess again—at least not in your time. You know nothing of bloodshed now, and neither do most of the thousands and thousands of young fellows like you, who are being led off to this thing right now. But I have seen you turn your head away out at the farm when I have been preparing chickens for our Sunday dinner—turn your head away at the sight of the hot blood oozing onto the ground, at the muscles twitching crazily, at the muscles of the windpipe still contracting and expanding after the head is severed, as the heart pumps the last of its life-blood away. You didn't like this when you saw it in a chicken, and you turned your head away, and it was right that you should."

"But when you see it in human beings, when you see men you have just been talking to, slashed and torn down in front of you, see them writhing and jerking in spasms on the ground, you go on in a daze that you really never recover from. At least I haven't. That's why I've shut up like a clam about it. And I've tried to drive it out of my mind. And the only time it gets me now is those nights—every once in a while—when it seems to flash back, and I have to get up and go downstairs and walk around for a couple of hours to get it out of my system."

"Yes, and even then I think we could have stood it all and been glad of what we'd done if we hadn't found out what a ghastly fate the whole thing was."

"You know we were taught from morning till night that the Germans were vicious Huns. We were ordered to curse as we rammed our bayonets through dummies, before we began the real thing.

"Well, you know I was a prisoner for a while in a German prison. The 3 months I spent there was the most human part of the war. German mothers would come to us and give us little good things to eat.

"Perhaps my boy is in prison too," they would say. "I hope some other mother will be kind to him."

"Now Bill," the father said, looking straight and searchingly into his son's eyes. "I'm not proud of what I went through. I hate myself for it. I hate myself for not talking to you long and earnestly about this before. I'm almost bitter that I belong to a human race that seems to be unable to think of anything better to do with its sons than to send them down into a pool of blood. I—Bill—"

The father's voice broke off. He stared at the rug. There was a long, long silence. Finally it was broken by Bill.

"Dad," he said, and his voice was high-pitched and shaking with emotion. "Let's—let's forget about that Duluth stuff. But damn it— and his voice rose almost angrily—"why didn't you ever talk to me like that before?"

As the father slumped back into his chair there were steps from the kitchen.

"Well," mother said, "you boys seem to be having quite an earnest discussion, judging from the tone of your voices out in the kitchen."

"Oh, just talking a little about the war," said the boy, and as he caught his father's eye he added in slow, measured words, "but we're not going to talk about that any more."

The father heaved a sigh of relief, almost as if in pain. There was perspiration on his forehead. Mother looked at him furtively.

"Why, dad, are you all right?"

"Oh, sure," dad answered. "It's that darn good cooking of yours. It's always making me eat too much. Hang it all, Bill, we should have helped your mother with the dishes."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOREN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Under the authority given to the Chair heretofore by unanimous consent, the Chair declares the House in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER THE RECESS

The recess having expired at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m., the House was called to order by the Speaker.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306) entitled "Joint Resolution Neutrality Act of 1939."

NEUTRALITY

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306), the Neutrality Act of 1939, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the conference report.

The Clerk began the reading of the conference report.

Mr. BLOOM (interrupting the reading of the report). Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact the statement is more explanatory than the report itself, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk began the reading of the statement.

Mr. RAYBURN (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, there is going to be some discussion of the report and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement may be dispensed with.

Mr. KNUTSON. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota objects. The Clerk will continue the reading of the statement.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the statement.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the conference report be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306), Neutrality Act of 1939, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Whereas the United States, desiring to preserve its neutrality in wars between foreign states and desiring also to avoid involvement therein, voluntarily imposes upon its nationals by domestic legislation the restrictions set out in this joint resolution; and

"Whereas by so doing the United States waives none of its own rights or privileges, or those of any of its nationals, under international law, and expressly reserves all the rights and privileges to which it and its nationals are entitled under the law of nations; and

"Whereas the United States hereby expressly reserves the right to repeal, change or modify this joint resolution or any other domestic legislation in the interests of the peace, security or welfare of the United States and its people: Therefore be it"

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"PROCLAMATION OF A STATE OF WAR BETWEEN FOREIGN STATES

"SECTION 1. (a) That whenever the President, or the Congress by concurrent resolution, shall find that there exists a state of war between foreign states, and that it is necessary to promote the security or preserve the peace of the United States or to protect the lives of citizens of the United States, the President shall issue a proclamation naming the states involved; and he shall, from time to time, by proclamation, name other states as and when they may become involved in the war.

"(b) Whenever the state of war which shall have caused the President to issue any proclamation under the authority of this section shall have ceased to exist with respect to any state named in such proclamation, he shall revoke such proclamation with respect to such state.

"COMMERCE WITH STATES ENGAGED IN ARMED CONFLICT

"SEC. 2. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a) it shall thereafter be unlawful for any American vessel to carry any passengers or any articles or materials to any state named in such proclamation.

"(b) Whoever shall violate any of the provisions of subsection (a) of this section or of any regulations issued thereunder shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$50,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both. Should the violation be by a corporation, organization, or association, each officer or director thereof participating in the violation shall be liable to the penalty herein prescribed.

"(c) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a) it shall thereafter be unlawful to export or transport, or attempt to export or transport, or cause to be exported or transported, from the United States to any state named in such proclamation, any articles or materials (except copyrighted articles or materials) until all right, title, and interest therein shall have been transferred to some foreign government, agency, institution, association, partnership, corporation, or national. Issuance of a bill of lading under which title to the articles or materials to be exported or transported passes to a foreign purchaser unconditionally upon the delivery of such articles or materials to a carrier, shall constitute a transfer of all right, title, and interest therein within the meaning of this subsection. The shipper of such articles or materials shall be required to file with the collector of the port from or through which they are to be exported a declaration under oath that he has complied with the requirements of this subsection with respect to transfer of right, title, and interest in such articles or materials, and that he will comply with such rules and regulations as shall be promulgated from time to time. Any such declaration so filed shall be a conclusive estoppel against any claim of any citizen of the United States of right, title, or interest in such articles or materials, if such citizen had knowledge of the filing of such declaration; and the exportation or transportation of any articles or materials without filing the declaration required by this subsection shall be a conclusive estoppel against any claim of any citizen of the United States of right, title, or interest in such articles or materials, if such citizen had knowledge of such violation. No loss incurred by any such citizen (1) in connection with the sale or transfer of right, title, and interest in any such

articles or materials or (2) in connection with the exportation or transportation of any such copyrighted articles or materials, shall be made the basis of any claim put forward by the Government of the United States.

"(d) Insurance written by underwriters on articles or materials included in shipments which are subject to restrictions under the provisions of this joint resolution, and on vessels carrying such shipments, shall not be deemed an American interest therein, and no insurance policy issued on such articles or materials, or vessels, and no loss incurred thereunder or by the owners of such vessels, shall be made the basis of any claim put forward by the Government of the United States.

"(e) Whenever any proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a) shall have been revoked with respect to any state the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply with respect to such state, except as to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

"(f) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to transportation by American vessels on or over lakes, rivers, and inland waters bordering on the United States, or to transportation by aircraft on or over lands bordering on the United States; and the provisions of subsection (c) of this section shall not apply (1) to such transportation of any articles or materials other than articles listed in a proclamation referred to in or issued under the authority of section 12 (i), or (2) to any other transportation on or over lands bordering on the United States of any articles or materials other than articles listed in a proclamation referred to in or issued under the authority of section 12 (i); and the provisions of subsections (a) and (c) of this section shall not apply to the transportation referred to in this subsection and subsections (g) and (h) of any articles or materials listed in a proclamation referred to in or issued under the authority of section 12 (i) if the articles or materials so listed are to be used exclusively by American vessels, aircraft, or other vehicles in connection with their operation and maintenance.

"(g) The provisions of subsections (a) and (c) of this section shall not apply to transportation by American vessels (other than aircraft) of mail, passengers, or any articles or materials (except articles or materials listed in a proclamation referred to in or issued under the authority of section 12 (i)) (1) to any port in the Western Hemisphere south of thirty-five degrees north latitude, (2) to any port in the Western Hemisphere north of thirty-five degrees north latitude and west of sixty-six degrees west longitude, (3) to any port on the Pacific or Indian Oceans, including the China Sea, the Tasman Sea, the Bay of Bengal, and the Arabian Sea, and any other dependent waters of either of such oceans, seas, or bays, or (4) to any port on the Atlantic Ocean or its dependent waters south of thirty degrees north latitude. The exceptions contained in this subsection shall not apply to any such port which is included within a combat area as defined in section 3 which applies to such vessels.

"(h) The provisions of subsections (a) and (c) of this section shall not apply to transportation by aircraft of mail, passengers, or any articles or materials (except articles or materials listed in a proclamation referred to in or issued under the authority of section 12 (i)) (1) to any port in the Western Hemisphere, or (2) to any port on the Pacific or Indian Oceans, including the China Sea, the Tasman Sea, the Bay of Bengal, and the Arabian Sea, and any other dependent waters of either of such oceans, seas, or bays. The exceptions contained in this subsection shall not apply to any such port which is included within a combat area as defined in section 3 which applies to such aircraft.

"(i) Every American vessel to which the provisions of subsections (g) and (h) apply, and every neutral vessel to which the provisions of subsection (i) apply, shall, before departing from a port or from the jurisdiction of the United States, file with the collector of customs of the port of departure, or if there is no such collector at such port then with the nearest collector of customs, a sworn statement (1) containing a complete list of all the articles and materials carried as cargo by such vessel, and the names and addresses of the consignees of all such articles and materials, and (2) stating the ports at which such articles and materials are to be unloaded and the ports of call of such vessel. All transportation referred to in subsection (f), (g), (h), and (i) of this section shall be subject to such restrictions, rules, and regulations as the President shall prescribe; but no loss incurred in connection with any transportation excepted under the provisions of subsections (g), (h), and (i) of this section shall be made the basis of any claim put forward by the Government of the United States.

"(j) Whenever all proclamations issued under the authority of section 1 (a) shall have been revoked, the provisions of subsections (f), (g), (h), (i), and (l) of this section shall expire.

"(k) The provisions of this section shall not apply to the current voyage of any American vessel which has cleared for a foreign port and has departed from a port or from the jurisdiction of the United States in advance of (1) the date of enactment of this joint resolution, or (2) any proclamation issued after such date under the authority of section 1 (a) of this joint resolution; but any such vessel shall proceed at its own risk after either of such dates, and no loss incurred in connection with any such vessel or its cargo after either of such dates shall be made the basis of any claim put forward by the Government of the United States.

"(l) The provisions of subsection (c) of this section shall not apply to the transportation by a neutral vessel to any port referred to in subsection (g) of this section of any articles or materials (except articles or materials listed in a proclamation referred to in or issued under the authority of section 12 (i)) so long as

such port is not included within a combat area as defined in section 3 which applies to American vessels.

"COMBAT AREAS

"SEC. 3. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), and he shall thereafter find that the protection of citizens of the United States so requires, he shall, by proclamation, define combat areas, and thereafter it shall be unlawful, except under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed, for any citizen of the United States or any American vessel to proceed into or through any such combat area. The combat areas so defined may be made to apply to surface vessels or aircraft, or both.

"(b) In case of the violation of any of the provisions of this section by any American vessel, or any owner or officer thereof, such vessel, owner, or officer shall be fined not more than \$50,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both. Should the owner of such vessel be a corporation, organization, or association, each officer or director participating in the violation shall be liable to the penalty hereinabove prescribed. In case of the violation of this section by any citizen traveling as a passenger, such passenger may be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned for not more than two years, or both.

"(c) The President may from time to time modify or extend any proclamation issued under the authority of this section, and when the conditions which shall have caused him to issue any such proclamation shall have ceased to exist he shall revoke such proclamation and the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply, except as to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

"AMERICAN RED CROSS

"SEC. 4. The provisions of section 2 (a) shall not prohibit the transportation by vessels under charter or other direction and control of the American Red Cross, proceeding under safe conduct granted by states named in any proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a), of officers and American Red Cross personnel, medical personnel, and medical supplies, food, and clothing, for the relief of human suffering.

"TRAVEL ON VESSELS OF BELLIGERENT STATES

"SEC. 5. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a) it shall thereafter be unlawful for any citizen of the United States to travel on any vessel of any state named in such proclamation, except in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be prescribed.

"(b) Whenever any proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a) shall have been revoked with respect to any state the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply with respect to such state, except as to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

"ARMING OF AMERICAN MERCHANT VESSELS PROHIBITED

"SEC. 6. Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), it shall thereafter be unlawful, until such proclamation is revoked, for any American vessel, engaged in commerce with any foreign state to be armed, except with small arms and ammunition therefor, which the President may deem necessary and shall publicly designate for the preservation of discipline aboard any such vessel.

"FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS

"SEC. 7. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), it shall thereafter be unlawful for any person within the United States to purchase, sell, or exchange bonds, securities, or other obligations of the government of any state named in such proclamation, or of any political subdivision of any such state, or of any person acting for or on behalf of the government of any such state or political subdivision thereof, issued after the date of such proclamation, or to make any loan or extend any credit (other than necessary credits accruing in connection with the transmission of telegraph, cable, wireless and telephone services) to any such government, political subdivision, or person. The provisions of this subsection shall also apply to the sale by any person within the United States to any person in a state named in any such proclamation of any articles or materials listed in a proclamation referred to in or issued under the authority of section 12 (i).

"(b) The provisions of this section shall not apply to a renewal or adjustment of such indebtedness as may exist on the date of such proclamation.

"(c) Whoever shall knowingly violate any of the provisions of this section or of any regulations issued thereunder shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$50,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both. Should the violation be by a corporation, organization, or association, each officer or director thereof participating in the violation shall be liable to the penalty herein prescribed.

"(d) Whenever any proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a) shall have been revoked with respect to any state the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply with respect to such state, except as to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

"SOLICITATION AND COLLECTION OF FUNDS AND CONTRIBUTIONS

"SEC. 8. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), it shall thereafter be unlawful for any person within the United States to solicit or receive

any contribution for or on behalf of the government of any state named in such proclamation or for or on behalf of any agent or instrumentality of any such state.

"(b) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the solicitation or collection of funds and contributions to be used for medical aid and assistance, or for food and clothing to relieve human suffering, when such solicitation or collection of funds and contributions is made on behalf of and for use by any person or organization which is not acting for or on behalf of any such government, but all such solicitations and collections of funds and contributions shall be in accordance with and subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed.

"(c) Whenever any proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a) shall have been revoked with respect to any state the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply with respect to such state, except as to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

"AMERICAN REPUBLICS

"Sec. 9. This joint resolution (except section 12) shall not apply to any American republic engaged in war against a non-American state or states, provided the American republic is not cooperating with a non-American state or states in such war.

"RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF AMERICAN PORTS

"Sec. 10. (a) Whenever, during any war in which the United States is neutral, the President, or any person thereunto authorized by him, shall have cause to believe that any vessel, domestic or foreign, whether requiring clearance or not, is about to carry out of a port or from the jurisdiction of the United States, fuel, men, arms, ammunition, implements of war, supplies, dispatches, or information to any warship, tender, or supply ship of a state named in a proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a), but the evidence is not deemed sufficient to justify forbidding the departure of the vessel as provided for by section 1, title V, chapter 30, of the Act approved June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 217, 221; U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 18, sec. 31), and if, in the President's judgment, such action will serve to maintain peace between the United States and foreign states, or to protect the commercial interests of the United States and its citizens, or to promote the security or neutrality of the United States, he shall have the power, and it shall be his duty, to require the owner, master, or person in command thereof, before departing from a port or from the jurisdiction of the United States, to give a bond to the United States, with sufficient sureties, in such amount as he shall deem proper, conditioned that the vessel will not deliver the men, or any fuel, supplies, dispatches, information, or any part of the cargo, to any warship, tender, or supply ship of a state named in a proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a).

"(b) If the President, or any person thereunto authorized by him, shall find that a vessel, domestic or foreign, in a port of the United States, has previously departed from a port or from the jurisdiction of the United States during such war and delivered men, fuel, supplies, dispatches, information, or any part of its cargo to a warship, tender, or supply ship of a state named in a proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a), he may prohibit the departure of such vessel during the duration of the war.

"(c) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under section 1 (a) he may, while such proclamation is in effect, require the owner, master, or person in command of any vessel, foreign or domestic, before departing from the United States, to give a bond to the United States, with sufficient sureties, in such amount as he shall deem proper, conditioned that no alien seaman who arrived on such vessel shall remain in the United States for a longer period than that permitted under the regulations, as amended from time to time, issued pursuant to section 33 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 168). Notwithstanding the provisions of said section 33, the President may issue such regulations with respect to the landing of such seamen as he deems necessary to insure their departure either on such vessel or another vessel at the expense of such owner, master, or person in command.

"SUBMARINES AND ARMED MERCHANT VESSELS

"Sec. 11. Whenever, during any war in which the United States is neutral, the President shall find that special restrictions placed on the use of the ports and territorial waters of the United States by the submarines or armed merchant vessels of a foreign state will serve to maintain peace between the United States and foreign states, or to protect the commercial interests of the United States and its citizens, or to promote the security of the United States, and shall make proclamation thereof, it shall thereafter be unlawful for any such submarine or armed merchant vessel to enter a port or the territorial waters of the United States or to depart therefrom, except under such conditions and subject to such limitations as the President may prescribe. Whenever, in his judgment, the conditions which have caused him to issue his proclamation have ceased to exist, he shall revoke his proclamation and the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply, except as to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

"NATIONAL MUNITIONS CONTROL BOARD

"Sec. 12. (a) There is hereby established a National Munitions Control Board (hereinafter referred to as the 'Board'). The Board shall consist of the Secretary of State, who shall be chairman and executive officer of the Board, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secre-

tary of Commerce. Except as otherwise provided in this section, or by other law, the administration of this section is vested in the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State shall promulgate such rules and regulations with regard to the enforcement of this section as he may deem necessary to carry out its provisions. The Board shall be convened by the chairman and shall hold at least one meeting a year.

"(b) Every person who engages in the business of manufacturing, exporting, or importing any arms, ammunition, or implements of war listed in a proclamation referred to in or issued under the authority of subsection (i) of this section, whether as an exporter, importer, manufacturer, or dealer, shall register with the Secretary of State his name, or business name, principal place of business, and places of business in the United States, and a list of the arms, ammunition, and implements of war which he manufactures, imports, or exports.

"(c) Every person required to register under this section shall notify the Secretary of State of any change in the arms, ammunition, or implements of war which he exports, imports, or manufactures; and upon such notification the Secretary of State shall issue to such person an amended certificate of registration, free of charge, which shall remain valid until the date of expiration of the original certificate. Every person required to register under the provisions of this section shall pay a registration fee of \$100. Upon receipt of the required registration fee, the Secretary of State shall issue a registration certificate valid for five years, which shall be renewable for further periods of five years upon the payment for each renewal of a fee of \$100; but valid certificates of registration (including amended certificates) issued under the authority of section 2 of the joint resolution of August 31, 1935, or section 5 of the joint resolution of August 31, 1935, as amended, shall, without payment of any additional registration fee, be considered to be valid certificates of registration issued under this subsection, and shall remain valid for the same period as if this joint resolution had not been enacted.

"(d) It shall be unlawful for any person to export, or attempt to export, from the United States to any other state, any arms, ammunition, or implements of war listed in a proclamation referred to in or issued under the authority of subsection (i) of this section, or to import, or attempt to import, to the United States from any other state, and of the arms, ammunition, or implements of war listed in any such proclamation, without first having submitted to the Secretary of State the name of the purchaser and the terms of sale and having obtained a license therefor.

"(e) All persons required to register under this section shall maintain, subject to the inspection of the Secretary of State, or any person or persons designated by him, such permanent records of manufacture for export, importation, and exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war as the Secretary of State shall prescribe.

"(f) Licenses shall be issued by the Secretary of State to persons who have registered as herein provided for, except in cases of export or import licenses where the export of arms, ammunition, or implements of war would be in violation of this joint resolution or any other law of the United States, or of a treaty to which the United States is a party, in which cases such licenses shall not be issued; but a valid license issued under the authority of section 2 of the joint resolution of August 31, 1935, or section 5 of the joint resolution of August 31, 1935, as amended, shall be considered to be a valid license issued under this subsection, and shall remain valid for the same period as if this joint resolution had not been enacted.

"(g) No purchase of arms, ammunition, or implements of war shall be made on behalf of the United States by any officer, executive department, or independent establishment of the Government from any person who shall have failed to register under the provisions of this joint resolution.

"(h) The Board shall make a report to Congress on January 3 and July 3 of each year, copies of which shall be distributed as are other reports transmitted to Congress. Such reports shall contain such information and data collected by the Board as may be considered of value in the determination of questions connected with the control of trade in arms, ammunition, and implements of war, including the name of the purchaser and the terms of sale made under any such license. The Board shall include in such reports a list of all persons required to register under the provisions of this joint resolution, and full information concerning the licenses issued hereunder, including the name of the purchaser and the terms of sale made under any such license.

"(i) The President is hereby authorized to proclaim upon recommendation of the Board from time to time a list of articles which shall be considered arms, ammunition, and implements of war for the purposes of this section; but the proclamation No. 2237, of May 1, 1937 (50 Stat. 1834), defining the term 'arms, ammunition, and implements of war' shall, until it is revoked, have full force and effect as if issued under the authority of this subsection.

"REGULATIONS

"Sec. 13. The President may, from time to time, promulgate such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with law, as may be necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of this joint resolution; and he may exercise any power or authority conferred on him by this joint resolution through such officer or officers, or agency or agencies, as he shall direct.

"UNLAWFUL USE OF THE AMERICAN FLAG

"Sec. 14. (a) It shall be unlawful for any vessel belonging to or operating under the jurisdiction of any foreign state to use the

flag of the United States thereon, or to make use of any distinctive signs or markings, indicating that the same is an American vessel.

"(b) Any vessel violating the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall be denied for a period of three months the right to enter the ports or territorial waters of the United States except in cases of force majeure.

"GENERAL PENALTY PROVISION

"Sec. 15. In every case of the violation of any of the provisions of this joint resolution or of any rule or regulation issued pursuant thereto where a specific penalty is not herein provided, such violator or violators, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$10,000, or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.

"DEFINITIONS

"Sec. 16. For the purposes of this joint resolution—

"(a) The term 'United States', when used in a geographical sense, includes the several states and Territories, the insular possessions of the United States (including the Philippine Islands), the Canal Zone, and the District of Columbia.

"(b) The term 'person' includes a partnership, company, association, or corporation, as well as a natural person.

"(c) The term 'vessel' means every description of watercraft and aircraft capable of being used as a means of transportation on, under, or over water.

"(d) The term 'American vessel' means any vessel documented, and any aircraft registered or licensed, under the laws of the United States.

"(e) The term 'state' shall include nation, government, and country.

"(f) The term 'citizen' shall include any individual owing allegiance to the United States, a partnership, company, or association composed in whole or in part of citizens of the United States, and any corporation organized and existing under the laws of the United States as defined in subsection (a) of this section.

"SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

"Sec. 17. If any of the provisions of this joint resolution, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the joint resolution, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

"APPROPRIATIONS

"Sec. 18. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and accomplish the purposes of this joint resolution.

"REPEALS

"Sec. 19. The joint resolution of August 31, 1935, as amended, and the joint resolution of January 8, 1937, are hereby repealed; but offenses committed and penalties, forfeitures, or liabilities incurred under either of such joint resolutions prior to the date of enactment of this joint resolution may be prosecuted and punished, and suits and proceedings for violations of either of such joint resolutions or of any rule or regulation issued pursuant thereto may be commenced and prosecuted, in the same manner and with the same effect as if such joint resolutions had not been repealed.

"SHORT TITLE

"Sec. 20. This joint resolution may be cited as the 'Neutrality Act of 1939.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the joint resolution, and agree to the same.

SOL BLOOM,
LUTHER A. JOHNSON,
JOHN KEE,

Managers on the part of the House.

KEY PITTMAN,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
ROBERT F. WAGNER,
TOM CONNALLY,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306), Neutrality Act of 1939, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House resolution contained a preamble stating the neutrality policy of the United States. The Senate amendment struck out the preamble. The conference agreement adopts the following preamble:

"Whereas the United States, desiring to preserve its neutrality, in wars between foreign states and desiring also to avoid involvement therein, voluntarily imposes upon its nationals by domestic legislation the restrictions set out in this joint resolution; and

"Whereas by so doing the United States waives none of its own rights or privileges, or those of any of its nationals, under international law, and expressly reserves all the rights and privileges to which it and its nationals are entitled under the law of nations; and

"Whereas the United States hereby expressly reserves the right to repeal, change, or modify this joint resolution or any other domestic legislation in the interests of the peace, security, or welfare of the United States and its people."

Section 1 (a) of both the House resolution and the Senate amendment provided that whenever the President or Congress, by concurrent resolution, shall find that there exists a state of war between foreign states and that it is necessary to promote the security or preserve the peace of the United States or to protect the lives of citizens of the United States, the President shall issue a proclamation naming the states involved and by subsequent proclamation name other states as and when they may become involved in the war. Section 1 (b) of the House resolution provided that when the conditions which have caused the President to issue any proclamation under subsection (a) have ceased to exist he shall revoke the same. Section 1 (b) of the Senate amendment provided that when the state of war which caused the President to issue a proclamation under subsection (a) shall have ceased to exist with respect to any state named in such proclamation, he shall revoke such proclamation with respect to such state. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

Section 2 of the House resolution placed an embargo on arms and ammunition from the United States to any belligerent states named in any such proclamation. There was no corresponding provision in the Senate amendment. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision and omits such embargo.

Section 3 of the House resolution prohibited a citizen of the United States to travel, except at his own risk, on any vessel of a state or states named in a proclamation issued by the President, unless in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President prescribed. Section 5 of the Senate amendment provided that it would be unlawful for any citizen of the United States, irrespective of whether he did so at his own risk, to travel on any vessel of any state named in a proclamation issued by the President, except in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be prescribed. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

Section 6 of the Senate amendment prohibited the arming of any American vessel engaged in commerce with any foreign state except with small arms and ammunition for the preservation of discipline. There was no comparable provision in the House resolution. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

Section 4 (a) of the House resolution provided that when the President issues a proclamation it shall thereafter be unlawful for any person within the United States to purchase, sell, or exchange obligations of the government of any state named in such proclamation, or of any political subdivision of any such state, or of any agent of the government of any such state, if such obligations were issued after the date of such proclamation. It also made it unlawful to make any loan or extend any credit to any such government, political subdivision, or agent. The President, however, could except from the operations of this section for a period of not more than 90 days without renewals ordinary commercial credits and short-time obligations in aid of legal transactions and of a character customarily used in normal peacetime commercial transactions. Section 7 of the Senate amendment contained similar provisions with respect to financial transactions between persons within the United States and states named in the President's proclamation, but omitted the provisions allowing the President to extend 90-day credits. The Senate amendment also contained a provision making it unlawful for any person within the United States to sell on credit any arms, ammunition, or implements of war to any person in a state named in any such proclamation. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision with a clarifying change under which the same provisions apply with respect to financial transactions with or in the obligations of an agent of a political subdivision of a state named in a proclamation. The agreement also exempts necessary credits accruing in connection with the transmission of cable, wireless, telegraph, and telephone services. It also requires that violations of the provisions of the section shall be punishable only if they are knowingly committed.

Section 4 (d) of the House resolution provided that after a proclamation had been issued by the President it would be unlawful, except in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President prescribed, to export or transport from the United States directly or indirectly to any state named in the proclamation any articles or materials until all right, title, and interest therein had been transferred to some foreign government, agency, institution, association, partnership, corporation, or national. It provided that the shipper of such articles or materials must file a declaration under oath that no citizen of the United States had any right, title, or interest in such articles or materials, and that such declaration would be a conclusive estoppel against any claim of any citizen of the United States of any right, title, or interest in such articles or materials. Insurance written by underwriters on such articles or materials was placed in the same category. A further provision excepted from the operation of this subsection trade on or over lands, lakes, rivers, and inland waters bordering on the United States. Section 2 of the Senate amendment, which included the substance of section 4 (d) of the House resolution, also restricted American vessels in subsection (a) from carrying any passengers, or any articles or materials, to any state named in a proclamation issued by the President. Such restriction on transportation applied to all articles or materials, including munitions. Subsection (c) of the Senate amendment pro-

hibited the exportation or transportation from the United States to any state named in such proclamation of any articles or materials (except copyrighted articles or materials) until all right, title, and interest therein shall have been transferred as was similarly provided in section 4 (d) of the House resolution. Subsection (c) also provided that issuance of a bill of lading under which title to the goods shipped passes to the purchaser unconditionally upon delivery of the goods to the carrier shall constitute such a transfer of all right, title, and interest therein within the meaning of the subsection. It also contained a provision similar to the one contained in the House resolution that the shipper of such articles or materials must file a declaration under oath that no citizen of the United States had any right, title, or interest in such articles or materials, but differed from the House provision in that such declaration would be a conclusive estoppel against any claim of any citizen of the United States of right, title, or interest in such articles or materials only if such citizen had knowledge of the exportation or transportation of such articles or materials or of the filing of such declaration. Copyrighted articles or materials which are excepted by the Senate amendment are placed in the same category as other articles or materials in that no loss incurred by any citizens of the United States in connection with their exportation or transportation shall be made the basis of any claim to be put forward by the Government of the United States. Subsection (f) of the Senate amendment exempted from the provisions of subsection (a) transportation by American vessels on or over lakes, rivers, and inland waters bordering on the United States and transportation by aircraft on or over lands bordering on the United States. It also exempted from the provisions of subsection (c) such transportation of any articles and materials other than munitions, and any other form of transportation (train, bus, truck, etc.) on or over lands bordering on the United States of any articles or materials other than munitions. This subsection also exempted from the provisions of subsections (a) and (c) transportation to places referred to in this subsection and subsections (g) and (h) of articles and materials listed in a proclamation issued under the authority of section 12 (1) (munitions) if such articles or materials are to be used exclusively by American vessels, aircraft, or other vehicles in connection with their operation or maintenance. Subsection (g) excepted from the provisions of subsections (a) and (c) transportation by American surface vessels of mail, passengers, or any articles or materials (except munitions) (1) to any port in the Western Hemisphere south of 35 degrees north latitude, (2) to any port in the Western Hemisphere north of 35 degrees north latitude and west of 66 degrees west longitude, (3) to any port on the Pacific or Indian Oceans, including the China Sea, the Tasman Sea, the Bay of Bengal, and the Arabian Sea, or (4) to any port on the Atlantic Ocean south of 30 degrees north latitude. A further provision in this subsection prevented an American surface vessel proceeding to any such port so listed above if such port is included within a combat area applying to surface vessels. Subsection (h) exempted from the provisions of subsections (a) and (c) transportation by aircraft of mail, passengers, or any articles or materials (except munitions) (1) to any port in the Western Hemisphere, or (2) to any port on the Pacific or Indian Oceans, including the China Sea, the Tasman Sea, the Bay of Bengal, and the Arabian Sea. A further provision in this subsection prevented aircraft proceeding to any such port so listed above if such port is included within a combat area applying to such aircraft. Subsection (i) provided that every American vessel which is permitted to travel to belligerents as provided in subsections (g) and (h) shall file an export declaration containing a list of the cargo, the names and addresses of the consignees of the cargo, the ports at which such cargo is to be unloaded, and the ports of call of such vessel. It also provided that the excepted transportation referred to in subsections (f), (g), and (h) shall be subject to such restrictions, rules, and regulations as the President shall prescribe. Subsection (j) provided that subsections (f), (g), (h), and (i) shall expire when no proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a) is in effect. Subsection (k) permitted an American vessel whose voyage was begun 7 days or more in advance of (1) the date of enactment of the joint resolution, or (2) any proclamation issued after such date under the authority of section 1 (a), to continue such voyage without regard to the provisions of the joint resolution.

The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the Senate amendment and inserts a provision under which the exemption with respect to the Pacific and Indian Oceans and the named bays and seas is extended to all dependent waters of such oceans, bays, or seas. The conference agreement substitutes for the requirement of filing an export declaration of the cargo, consignees, and ports, the requirement of a sworn statement containing the same information. The conference agreement also provides that neutral vessels shall have the same exemptions relating to southern Atlantic, Pacific, and Indian Ocean transportation as apply to American vessels with respect to the requirement of transfer of title, but this exemption only applies as long as the port of destination is not within a combat area. A sworn statement by the neutral vessel as to cargo, etc., is also required. The conference agreement also exempts from the section American vessels which on the voyage then in progress have cleared for a foreign port or from the United States jurisdiction before the date of the enactment of the joint resolution or the proclamation. In such cases after the applicable date the vessel travels at its own risk, and loss to it or its cargo is not to be the basis of a claim by the United States.

The conference agreement also makes some minor technical and clerical changes.

Section 3 of the Senate amendment required the President, if he finds that the protection of citizens of the United States so requires, to define combat areas into or through which it shall be unlawful for any citizen of the United States or any American vessel to proceed unless the President grants an exception to such citizen or vessel. It also allowed the President to make such combat areas applicable to surface vessels only, or to aircraft only, or to both. Penalty for violation of the section was a fine of \$50,000, or imprisonment for 5 years, or both. There was no comparable provision in the House resolution. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

Section 4 of the Senate amendment provided that the prohibition contained in section 2 (a) shall not prohibit the transportation by vessels under the control of the American Red Cross, which are proceeding under safe conduct granted by belligerent states, of officers and American Red Cross personnel, medical personnel, medical supplies, food, and clothing, for the relief of human suffering. There was no comparable provision in the House resolution. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

Section 5 of the House resolution made it unlawful for any person in the United States to solicit or receive any contribution for or on behalf of the government of any belligerent state or of any association, organization, or agent of any such state, but allowed solicitation or collection of contributions to be used for medical aid and assistance, or for food and clothing to relieve human suffering, when such solicitation or collection is made on behalf of or for use by any person or organization which is not acting as an agent or in aid of any such belligerent state. Such solicitations and collections, however, were to be subject to the approval of the President and were to be made under such rules and regulations as he prescribed. Section 8 of the Senate amendment contained a similar provision with certain clarifying changes in language. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

Section 6 of the House resolution provided that the provisions of the joint resolution preceding such section shall not apply to any American republic. Section 9 of the Senate amendment provided that it shall not apply to any American republic engaged in a war against a non-American state or states, if the American republic is not cooperating with a non-American state or states in such war. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment to insure that section 12 (relating to the Munitions Control Board) applies in the case of such republics.

Section 7 of the House resolution authorized the President, during any war in which the United States is neutral, under certain conditions to require the owner, master, or person in command of any vessel, whether domestic or foreign, before departing from a port of the United States, to give a bond to the United States conditioned that the vessel will not deliver any men or any part of its cargo to any warship, tender, or supply ship of a belligerent state. It further provided that if the President finds that any such vessel has previously cleared from a port of the United States during such war and delivered its cargo or any part thereof to a warship, tender, or supply ship of a belligerent state, he may prohibit the departure of such vessel for the duration of the war. Section 10 of the Senate amendment in subsections (a) and (b) contained similar provisions to those in section 7 of the House resolution, but made certain clarifying changes in language, and added "supplies, dispatches, or information" to the articles to which the prohibition in such section related. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

Section 10 (c) of the Senate amendment permitted the President to require of the owner, master, or person in command of any vessel, foreign or domestic, before departing from the United States to give a bond to the United States conditioned that no alien seaman who arrived on such vessel shall remain in the United States for a longer period than that permitted under the regulations issued pursuant to section 33 of the Immigration Act. The President was also authorized to issue regulations with respect to the landing of such seamen as he deemed necessary to insure their departure either on such vessel or another vessel at the expense of such owner, master, or person in command. There were no corresponding provisions in the House resolution. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision with clarifying changes.

Section 8 of the House resolution provided that if the President shall find, during any war in which the United States is neutral, that special restrictions placed on the use of the ports and territorial waters of the United States by the submarines or armed merchant vessels of a belligerent state will serve to maintain peace between the United States and the belligerent state, or to protect the commercial interests of the United States or its citizens, or to promote the security of the United States, and shall make proclamation thereof, it shall thereafter be unlawful for any such submarine or armed merchant vessel to enter a port or the territorial waters of the United States or to depart therefrom, except under such conditions and subject to such limitations as the President may prescribe. Section 11 of the Senate amendment contained similar provisions with certain clarifying changes in language but made the prohibition apply to the submarines and armed merchant vessels of all foreign states rather than limiting it only to belligerent states. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision with one minor technical amendment.

Section 9 of the House resolution established a National Munititions Control Board and provided for the registration and licensing of every person who engages in the business of manufacturing, exporting, or importing any of the arms, ammunition, or implements of war referred to in the joint resolution. Administration of such registration and licensing was vested in the Department of State. Subsection (h) of section 9 repealed as of December 31, 1937, the provisions of the act of August 29, 1916, relating to the sale of ordnance and stores to the Government of Cuba. Subsection (i) of such section provided for annual reports to Congress by the Board, except when a proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a) was in effect, in which case reports were to be made every 90 days so long as such proclamation remained in effect. Section 12 of the Senate amendment contained similar provisions with certain clarifying changes in language, and provided that the Board shall make a report to Congress on January 1 and July 1 of each year without requiring the 90-day report provided for in the House resolution. The Senate amendment also omitted the provision contained in the House resolution repealing the act of August 29, 1916, since such repeal took effect on December 31, 1937. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision with one minor change, requiring the reports of the Board to be submitted on January 3 and July 3 of each year instead of January 1 and July 1.

Section 14 of the Senate amendment made it unlawful for any vessel belonging to or operating under the jurisdiction of any foreign state to use the flag of the United States thereon, or to make use of any distinctive signs or markings, indicating that the same is an American vessel. Any vessel violating this provision would be denied for a period of 3 months the right to enter the ports or territorial waters of the United States except in cases of force majeure. There was no comparable provision in the House resolution. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

Section 11 of the House resolution contained a general penalty provision carrying a fine of not more than \$1,000, or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both. Section 15 of the Senate amendment contained a general penalty provision carrying a fine of not more than \$10,000, or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

Section 12 of the House resolution contained general definitions. Section 16 of the Senate amendment contained the same definitions but added two new paragraphs defining "American vessel" and "citizen." The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

Section 15 of the House resolution repealed the acts of 1935, 1936, and 1937 (relating to American neutrality) and contained a saving provision that such repeal would not affect the validity of the proclamation numbered 2237 of May 1, 1937, defining the term "arms, ammunition, and implements of war," or of certificates of registration or licenses issued pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the act of May 1, 1937. Section 19 of the Senate amendment contained similar provisions with certain clarifying changes in language and an additional provision that offenses committed and penalties, forfeitures, or liabilities incurred under such repealed joint resolutions prior to the date of enactment of this joint resolution may be prosecuted and punished, and suits and proceedings for violations of either of such joint resolutions or of any rule or regulation issued pursuant thereto may be commenced and prosecuted, in the same manner and with the same effect as if such joint resolutions had not been repealed. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision except that the provisions relating to existing licenses and certificates of registration, and to Proclamation No. 2237, have been transferred with minor technical changes to the provisions of the conference agreement dealing with the respective subject matters.

Section 20 of the Senate amendment contained a short title. There was no comparable provision in the House bill. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

The House resolution contained the title "Joint Resolution, Neutrality Act of 1939". The Senate amendment changed the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to preserve the neutrality and the peace of the United States and to secure the safety of its citizens and their interests." The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

SOL BLOOM,
LUTHER A. JOHNSON,
JOHN KEE,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Is the Clerk through with the reading of the report?

Mr. BLOOM. This is the statement and not the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] asked unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with; the Chair asked if there was objection, and no objection was offered.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, your conferees on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the neutrality resolution have met with the Senate conferees and have reached an agreement. Inasmuch as the House by vote refused to instruct your managers, they entered the conference free to negotiate the best compromise under the circumstances.

Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] desire any time?

Mr. FISH. Yes; I would like to be recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, this is the Senate bill, which the House has hardly considered or discussed. We did have the right to offer three amendments to the bill as the Senate wrote it.

The conferees met this afternoon, and they adopted by, I think, a unanimous vote, a number of minor amendments. I believe that my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] and myself were in accord with all the amendments. They were of very little consequence except to certain shipping interests on the western coast. They liberalized the provisions with respect to such shipping interests and their rights, and we favored all amendments that were made in the conference.

My colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] and myself did not sign the report; neither did the two minority members of the Senate, Senator BORAH and Senator JOHNSON of California.

The bill, as I have pointed out to you, is practically the Senate bill, which we have hardly discussed in the House at all. It contains the combat-area power, giving the President power to determine combat areas. I believe—and I think I am right in saying so—under the bill as now written in the Senate, American ships may go into the war zones, into the British Channel and into the North Sea, carrying American goods to Holland and Belgium and the Norwegian countries. Now, I submit, Mr. Speaker, if there is any such thing as a war zone, it is the British Channel and the North Sea, and our ships are now permitted, except for carrying arms, ammunition, and implements of war, and will still be permitted, to continue into the war zone unless the President declares that to be a combat area.

I also believe, and it is natural to assume, that the German Government, if it carries out the announcement it made today of unrestricted submarine warfare, will attack ships in the British Channel and in the North Sea, probably in the nighttime as well as in the daytime, and they will not know whether those ships are American, are neutral ships, or French or German ships, and I anticipate, if our merchant marine are permitted to carry scrap iron and steel and copper and so on into the North Sea and into the English Channel, that we will lose some of our own ships, and then again immediately we will be confronted by an issue with the German Government. Of course, we on the minority side and many of those on the majority side, made our fight. We have no complaint to make. The war is over except for the final vote on this bill. But the great issue has just begun, and that is keeping America out of foreign wars. [Applause.] I do not see how it keeps America out of foreign wars if we permit our merchant ships to go into that very definite combat zone that everyone must admit, no matter to what party he belongs, even those from the very solid South, to be a very dangerous zone, and I refer to the British Channel and the North Sea. It is certainly a dangerous place to be, infested as it is with submarines and airplanes and enemy warships. That is one of the objections. We could not offer that amendment in the House. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] had the amendment prepared, but under the rule he was precluded from offering it because, if carried, it would have done away with the amendments that had already been offered prior to his.

Another part of the Senate bill which I think is objectionable and very vicious is the part that permits a British subject or a French subject to come over here and, let us say, negotiate a loan with J. P. Morgan & Co. in New York to buy all the scrap iron and all the copper and all the lead and all the steel that they may want. They may negotiate a loan for a billion dollars under the provisions of the Senate bill which we are now called upon to vote on, and which, I repeat, was never discussed in this House. That bill is the conference report. They can negotiate this loan from Morgan

& Co. or any other international banker, buy all they want of that kind of material here, and take it back to England or France and sell it to some private concern, and it may go into munitions, and then, after that, I think it will be very difficult to prove that that went to the British Government or to the French Government. I believe that is the loophole for the United States to finance these wars in Europe, and I am opposed to having our Government, or our people, rather, finance any more wars in Europe and hold the bag for Europe and European wars. [Applause.]

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Was there any change in section 7 to definitely define the word "person" so that it would include the Federal Reserve banks, the Stabilization Corporation, the Export-Import Bank, or any other Federal agency, and preclude them from giving credit to foreigners?

Mr. FISH. That, I consider, would be a major amendment, and no major amendments were made to this conference report. They voted that down in the House, and therefore we could not present it. We did not have the power even to offer it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. But we were told here by the leaders on the majority side that the word "person" precluded the Government from extending any credit to any of the countries, but it is not here in the bill.

Mr. FISH. It is made very clear that individuals from those countries could come here and get all the money they want for this purpose, take back their goods, and then the difficulty would be to prove whether the goods went to a private industry or to the government.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. BLOOM. Did not the gentleman vote for those amendments that were offered?

Mr. FISH. I have already said that I voted for all of the amendments offered to the conference report.

Mr. BLOOM. Was not this brought up in the conference, and was not the word "person" explained to the satisfaction of everybody, as to just what that means?

Mr. FISH. There was no such amendment offered in the conference. I do not know whether I am permitted to quote anyone else, but I clearly asked the chairman to explain that, and some other Member asked the same thing. It was agreed that an individual could come here and borrow almost unlimited sums and buy our goods, all except war materials, and take them back.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Was any provision put in the bill by the conferees placing restrictions on the sale of poison gas or flame throwers?

Mr. FISH. I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi that I offered that amendment myself in conference and made the best fight I could for it, saying that I knew it would be turned down in the Senate, but I thought that the conferees ought to yield because the people back home would be unanimous for such an amendment, and if they wanted to amend the bill, they ought to accept the amendment. They took the position that having been defeated in the Senate they could not accept that amendment in all fairness. That is the reason given. I tried to get them to take it up by unanimous consent, take it back to the Senate, and say that the public had not been heard from at that time, and then bring the bill back in the House; but we were precluded under the rules from doing that, and so we could not get a vote in the House.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. Does the gentleman state that he offered that as an amendment, or that he just made that as a suggestion?

Mr. FISH. That is more or less quibbling, and I do not believe we ought to quibble. I offered it directly, asked them to consider and accept it. They told me they could not do it.

Mr. BLOOM. Did not the gentleman ask the parliamentary situation with reference to the poison-gas and flame-thrower amendment, and was it not explained to him at the time?

Mr. FISH. I wanted to offer this amendment, and they told me that the Senate rules precluded it because it had been defeated in the Senate. Then I made my fight.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. As a matter of fact, since that provision was in the bill as it passed the House, it seems to me the conferees would have had a perfect right to include it in the conference report and give the House a right to vote on it.

Mr. FISH. I made that argument to the best of my ability, but it was very evident they did not want to agree to it, and they had the votes. That is the answer to that.

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no.

Mr. FISH. I made the best argument I could, but my views did not prevail.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. It was shown that that was specifically mentioned in the Shanley motion, was it not?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. BLOOM. Being, therefore, specifically mentioned in the Shanley motion it could not be taken up in the conference, the Shanley motion having been defeated in the House.

Mr. FISH. But it was also mentioned, of course, in the House bill. The words were in there.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The mere fact that it was mentioned in the Shanley motion did not preclude its consideration by the conferees, for it was also contained in the House bill.

Mr. FISH. I cannot yield further, we are just wasting time, because I assure the gentleman that I made the best possible fight I could. I did not know that the gentleman knew anything about it, but that is water over the dam, and it is useless to discuss it further.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. This morning on the floor with respect to the interpretation which the Federal Reserve Board had put upon the word "person," in section 7, I had this to say:

I am advised by long distance this morning from New York that the Federal Reserve banks have already been given the "go" sign, in view of the action taken by the House yesterday, to furnish the credits by which belligerents may purchase war materials in this country.

Was this statement before the conferees when they gave consideration to this section?

Mr. FISH. No; that was not brought into the conference at all.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Did they give any consideration to the interpretation which the Federal Reserve had already placed on this word "person"?

Mr. FISH. No.

Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a press report for the attention of Members from the farm districts, whether they be from the South or West. I took the trouble to check up the vote a little while ago and I found that in 11 Southern States, omitting Louisiana, the vote was 90 to 1 [applause]—and I made my statement that way so you would clap at that time because you might not want to cheer when I read what I have here in my hand. The statement is the same in all the papers and all the press of the country, evidently:

Due to the arms embargo vote and the ability of the British now to buy arms, munitions, and implements of war in America, they would cut down by \$150,000,000 their purchases of American farm products of the South and of the West.

[Laughter.]

Now you can applaud.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. FISH. Certainly I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. Whoever made that statement might as well have said \$500,000,000 or \$1,000,000,000 as to have said \$150,000,000. It is simply a statement that somebody picks out of the air. There is no British authority for it.

Mr. FISH. I may state to the gentleman that it comes from London and is a United Press article.

It was not any American propaganda against the bill. This comes from London. They ought to know what they are going to do to the farmers, and they evidently do.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does anything come from London by the United Press that is not passed by the official British censors?

Mr. FISH. I do not think so, and I think the British censorship is the strictest of any nation in the world. This came from London and for that reason I should say it is accurate. It has been passed by the British censors.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman indicate that the article stated there would be no reduction in the purchase of cotton?

Mr. FISH. I have not that part. I only have a short article here.

Mr. PACE. It stated there would be no reduction in the purchase of cotton.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, may I answer the gentleman about cotton and the price of cotton? We have already made a trade agreement giving 600,000 bales of cotton to England in return for rubber. How in the world is England going to buy any more cotton when we have already made this trade agreement? I do not believe they are going to buy any more cotton for the time being because they already have the 600,000 bales.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Over the short wave from London I heard the British say that they were going to buy cotton and bully beef in Central and South America.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to make a statement that I would have made yesterday if I had had the time which I anticipated I had at that time. I want this to go into the RECORD without any fear on my part of contradiction, that no nation in the world sells arms, ammunition, or implements of war to any belligerent nation; yet we were asked to repeal our law so that we could sell arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerents. I submit there is not a single European nation or an American nation that is selling a dollar's worth of arms and ammunition to any of the belligerent nations. Furthermore, I want to state for the RECORD that Switzerland has a permanent law against selling arms and ammunition to belligerents. Norway, Sweden, and Denmark have licensing laws which accomplish virtually the same thing. All of the European nations have refused to sell arms and ammunition to belligerent nations. One reason given by their ambassadors and ministers, and the sole reason, is that they wanted to stay neutral in this war in Europe. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I now ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at a later time a half a dozen letters addressed to me by these various ministers and ambassadors making the specific statement to which I refer—that is, that they are not selling any arms, ammunition, or implements of war—and these will cover all of the European countries.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

There was no objection.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE].

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] said really has nothing to do with the adoption of this conference report. We have brought back to you the bill which has the endorsement of this House. We have brought it back practically unchanged either in form or substance. The slight amendments we have made to the bill or to any section of it are merely clarifying amendments in order to remove from the measure any sentences or paragraphs of doubtful meaning.

Among these clarifying amendments is a slight revision of section 2 (c) with reference to transfer of title, to the end that an unconditional bill of lading is in compliance with the transfer requirements contained in the bill. I am speaking now of the more important changes that were made. We clarified the provision containing the exceptions of the waters into which American ships may go. You will notice in the bill as originally drawn that it excepted the China Sea, the Bay of Bengal, and the Arabian Sea, as well as the Atlantic Ocean south of the thirtieth degree of north latitude. We clarified that by merely adding "and their dependent waters," in order that all of the ports upon the seas excepted might be included and, as a matter of fact, that no mistake be made that those ports are not within the exceptions.

Those are the two most substantial amendments that have been made. The argument presented by the gentleman from New York is the same argument made on yesterday, the day before, and the week before, and it applies to the main features of the bill, all controversy on which has already been determined by a vote of the House. His argument is not pertinent to the changes made by the conferees.

The bill as it stands today is, in my opinion, the best possible act that could be passed by the Congress of the United States to keep our country free from the conflict that is now raging throughout the world.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. I desire to inquire about the change that was made in connection with the elimination of the 7-day provision as to sailing. I understand there was some change made.

Mr. KEE. There was a change made.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I may say to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] that the Senate bill contained a provision that a boat would have to sail from the United States 7 days before the law became effective, otherwise it would not be exempt.

That, we thought, was unfair because a ship might be about 6 days out and would have to turn around and come back.

A criminal penalty was provided and we thought it should not be retroactive. We provided it should not apply to any ship that had left the United States prior to the date of the enactment of the law.

Mr. BLAND. How about the cargo, is that brought in, too?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes; both are exempt.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I do not have anything further to say about this conference report. Enough has already been said about it. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLOOM. I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 243, nays 172, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]
YEAS—243

Allen, La.	Dickstein	Keller	Poage
Allen, Pa.	Dies	Kelly	Polk
Anderson, Calif.	Dingell	Kennedy, Michael	Ramspeck
Arnold	Disney	Kerr	Randolph
Ball	Doughton	Kilday	Rayburn
Barden	Doxey	Kirwan	Richards
Barnes	Drewry	Kitchens	Robertson
Bates, Ky.	Duncan	Kieberg	Robinson, Utah
Beam	Dunn	Kocalkowski	Rogers, Okla.
Beckworth	Durham	Kramer	Romjue
Bell	Eberharter	Lanham	Sabath
Bland	Edmiston	Larrabee	Sacks
Bloom	Elliott	Lea	Sasser
Boehne	Ellis	Leavy	Satterfield
Boland	Faddis	Lesinski	Schaefer, Ill.
Boren	Fay	Lewis, Colo.	Schuetz
Boykin	Ferguson	McAndrews	Schulte
Bradley, Pa.	Fernandez	McArdle	Schwert
Brewster	Fitzpatrick	McCormack	Scruggam
Brooks	Flaherty	McGehee	Sheppard
Brown, Ga.	Flannagan	McGranery	Sirovich
Bryson	Flannery	McKeough	Smith, Ill.
Buck	Folger	McLean	Smith, Wash.
Buckler, Minn.	Ford, Leland M.	McMillan	Smith, W. Va.
Buckley, N. Y.	Ford, Miss.	Maclejewski	Snyder
Bulwinkle	Ford, Thomas F.	Magnuson	Somers, N. Y.
Burch	Fulmer	Mahon	South
Burgin	Gamble	Maloney	Sparkman
Byrne, N. Y.	Garrett	Marcantonio	Spence
Byrns, Tenn.	Gathings	Martin, Colo.	Starnes, Ala.
Byron	Gavagan	Martin, Ill.	Steagall
Caldwell	Geyer, Calif.	Massingale	Stearns, N. H.
Camp	Gibbs	May	Sullivan
Cannon, Fla.	Gifford	Merritt	Summers, Tex.
Cannon, Mo.	Gore	Mills, Ark.	Sutphin
Cartwright	Gossett	Mills, La.	Tarver
Casey, Mass.	Grant, Ala.	Mitchell	Taylor, Tenn.
Celler	Green	Monroney	Tenerowicz
Chandler	Gregory	Moser	Terry
Clark	Griffith	Mouton	Thomas, N. J.
Claypool	Gwynne	Murdock, Ariz.	Thomas, Tex.
Cluett	Hare	Murdock, Utah	Thomason
Cochran	Hart	Myers	Vincent, Ky.
Coffee, Wash.	Harter, Ohio	Nelson	Vinson, Ga.
Cole, N. Y.	Havener	Nichols	Voorhis, Calif.
Collins	Hendricks	Norrell	Vreeland
Colmer	Hennings	Norton	Wadsworth
Cooley	Hill	O'Neal	Wallgren
Cooper	Hobbs	Osmer	Walter
Courtney	Hook	O'Toole	Ward
Cox	Houston	Pace	Warren
Cravens	Izac	Parsons	Weaver
Creal	Jarman	Patman	West
Crowe	Johnson, Luther A.	Patrick	Whelchel
Cullen	Johnson, Lyndon	Patton	Whittington
Cummings	Johnson, Okla.	Pearson	Williams, Mo.
D'Alessandro	Johnson, W. Va.	Peterson, Fla.	Wood
Darden	Jones, Tex.	Peterson, Ga.	Woodrum, Va.
Delaney	Kean	Pierce, N. Y.	Zimmerman
Dempsey	Kee	Pierce, Oreg.	The Speaker
DeRoven	Kefauver	Plumley	

NAYS—172

Alexander	Dondero	Hope	Mundt
Allen, Ill.	Douglas	Horton	Murray
Andersen, H. Carl	Dowell	Hull	O'Brien
Anderson, Mo.	Dworshak	Hunter	O'Connor
Andersen, A. H.	Eaton	Jacobsen	O'Day
Angell	Elston	Jarrett	O'Leary
Arends	Engel	Jenkins, Ohio	Oliver
Ashbrook	Englebright	Jenks, N. H.	Pittenger
Austin	Evans	Jensen	Powers
Barton	Fenton	Johns	Rabaut
Bates, Mass.	Fish	Johnson, Ill.	Rankin
Bender	Fries	Johnson, Ind.	Reece, Tenn.
Blackney	Gartner	Jones, Ohio	Reed, Ill.
Bolles	Gearhart	Keefe	Reed, N. Y.
Bradley, Mich.	Gehrmann	Kinzer	Rees, Kans.
Brown, Ohio	Gerlach	Knutson	Rich
Burdick	Gilchrist	Kunkel	Risk
Carlson	Gillie	Lambertson	Robison, Ky.
Carter	Graham	Landis	Rockefeller
Case, S. Dak.	Grant, Ind.	LeCompte	Rodgers, Pa.
Chapman	Gross	Lemke	Rogers, Mass.
Church	Guyer, Kans.	Lewis, Ohio	Routzohr
Clason	Hall	Luce	Rutherford
Clevenger	Halleck	Ludlow	Ryan
Coffee, Nebr.	Hancock	McDowell	Sandager
Cole, Md.	Harness	McLaughlin	Schaefer, Wis.
Connery	Harrington	McLeod	Schiffner
Corbett	Harter, N. Y.	Maas	Secombe
Costello	Hartley	Mapes	Secrest
Crawford	Hawks	Marshall	Seger
Crosser	Healey	Martin, Iowa	Shafer, Mich.
Crowther	Heinke	Martin, Mass.	Shanley
Culkin	Hess	Mason	Shannon
Curtis	Hinshaw	Michener	Short
Dirksen	Hoffman	Miller	Simpson
Ditter	Holmes	Mott	Smith, Conn.

Smith, Maine	Talle	Van Zandt	Williams, Del.
Smith, Ohio	Thill	Vorys, Ohio	Winter
Springer	Thorkelson	Welch	Wolcott
Stefan	Tibbott	Wheat	Wolfenden, Pa.
Sumner, Ill.	Tinkham	White, Idaho	Wolverton, N. J.
Sweeney	Tolan	White, Ohio	Woodruff, Mich.
Taber	Treadway	Wigglesworth	Youngdahl

NOT VOTING—14

Andrews	Darrow	Keogh	Smith, Va.
Barry	Jeffries	Mansfield	Taylor, Colo.
Chipperfield	Kennedy, Martin	Monkiewicz	
Curley	Kennedy, Md.	Pfeifer	

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.
The Clerk called the name of Mr. BANKHEAD, and he answered "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Taylor of Colorado (for) with Mr. Andrews (against).
Mr. Smith of Virginia (for) with Mr. Darrow (against).
Mr. Monkiewicz (for) with Mr. Chipperfield (against).
Mr. Keogh (for) with Mr. Barry (against).
Mr. Martin J. Kennedy (for) with Mr. Pfeifer (against).
Mr. Kennedy of Maryland (for) with Mr. Jeffries (against).

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that my colleague the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. SMITH, is detained by illness. If present, he would have voted "yea."

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested.

S. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution providing for the sine die adjournment of the second session of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT RESOLUTION

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 31.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 31

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Friday, the 3d day of November 1939, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate concurrent resolution.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 223, nays 189, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]
YEAS—223

Allen, La.	Celler	Durham	Hunter
Allen, Pa.	Chandler	Edmiston	Izac
Anderson, Mo.	Clark	Elliott	Jarman
Arnold	Claypool	Ellis	Johnson, Luther A.
Ashbrook	Cochran	Faddis	Johnson, Lyndon
Barden	Coffee, Nebr.	Fay	Johnson, Okla.
Barnes	Cole, Md.	Ferguson	Johnson, W. Va.
Bates, Ky.	Collins	Fitzpatrick	Jones, Tex.
Beam	Colmer	Flaherty	Kee
Bell	Cooley	Flannagan	Kefauver
Bland	Cooper	Flannery	Keller
Bloom	Costello	Folger	Kelly
Boehne	Courtney	Ford, Miss.	Kennedy, Michael
Boland	Cox	Ford, Thomas F.	Kerr
Boren	Creal	Fries	Kirwan
Boykin	Crosser	Fulmer	Kitchens
Bradley, Pa.	Crowe	Gathings	Kieberg
Brooks	Cullen	Gavagan	Kocalkowski
Brown, Ga.	Cummings	Geyer, Calif.	Kramer
Bryson	D'Alessandro	Gibbs	Lanham
Buck	Darden	Gore	Larrabee
Buckler, Minn.	Delaney	Gossett	Lea
Buckley, N. Y.	Dempsey	Grant, Ala.	Leavy
Bulwinkle	DeRoven	Gregory	Lesinski
Burch	Dickstein	Griffith	Lewis, Colo.
Burgin	Dies	Hare	McAndrews
Byrne, N. Y.	Dingell	Harter, Ohio	McArdle
Byron	Disney	Havener	McCormack
Camp	Doughton	McGehee	McGranery
Cannon, Fla.	Doxey	Hendricks	McKeough
Cannon, Mo.	Duncan	Hennings	McLaughlin
Cartwright	Dunn	Hobbs	McMillan
		Houston	

Maciejewski	O'Leary	Sacks	Summers, Tex.
Magnuson	O'Neal	Sasser	Sutphin
Mahon	O'Toole	Satterfield	Tarver
Maloney	Pace	Schaefer, Ill.	Tenerowicz
Marcantonio	Parsons	Schuetz	Terry
Martin, Colo.	Patman	Schulte	Thomas, Tex.
Martin, Ill.	Patrick	Schwert	Thomason
Massingale	Pearson	Secret	Vincent, Ky.
Merritt	Peterson, Fla.	Shanley	Vinson, Ga.
Mills, Ark.	Peterson, Ga.	Shannon	Wallgren
Mills, La.	Pierce, Oreg.	Sheppard	Walter
Mitchell	Poage	Sirovich	Ward
Monroney	Polk	Smith, Conn.	Warren
Mouton	Rabaut	Smith, Ill.	Weaver
Murdock, Ariz.	Ramspeck	Smith, W. Va.	West
Murdock, Utah	Rayburn	Snyder	Whelchel
Myers	Richards	Somers, N. Y.	Whittington
Nelson	Robertson	South	Williams, Mo.
Nichols	Robinson, Utah	Sparkman	Wood
Norrell	Rogers, Okla.	Spence	Woodrum, Va.
Norton	Romjue	Starnes, Ala.	Zimmerman
O'Connor	Ryan	Steagall	The Speaker
O'Day	Sabath	Sullivan	

NAYS—189

Alexander	Englebright	Keefe	Routzohn
Allen, Ill.	Evans	Kilday	Rutherford
Andersen, H. Carl	Fenton	Kinzer	Sandager
Anderson, Calif.	Fish	Knutson	Schafer, Wis.
Andresen, A. H.	Ford, Leland M.	Kunkel	Schiffler
Angeli	Gamble	Lambertson	Scrugham
Arends	Garrett	Landis	Secombe
Austin	Gartner	LeCompte	Seger
Ball	Gearhart	Lemke	Shafer, Mich.
Barton	Gehrmann	Lewis, Ohio	Short
Bates, Mass.	Gerlach	Luce	Simpson
Beckworth	Gifford	Ludlow	Smith, Maine
Bender	Gilchrist	McDowell	Smith, Ohio
Blackney	Gillie	McLean	Smith, Wash.
Bolles	Graham	McLeod	Springer
Bradley, Mich.	Grant, Ind.	Maas	Stearns, N. H.
Brewster	Green	Mapes	Stefan
Brown, Ohio	Gross	Marshall	Sumner, Ill.
Burdick	Guyer, Kans.	Martin, Iowa	Sweeney
Byrns, Tenn.	Gwynne	Martin, Mass.	Taber
Carlson	Hall	Mason	Talle
Carter	Halleck	Michener	Taylor, Tenn.
Case, S. Dak.	Hancock	Miller	Thill
Casey, Mass.	Harness	Monkiewicz	Thomas, N. J.
Chapman	Harrington	Moser	Thorkelson
Church	Hart	Mott	Tibbott
Clason	Harter, N. Y.	Mundt	Tinkham
Clevenger	Hartley	Murray	Tolan
Cluett	Hawks	O'Brien	Treadway
Coffee, Wash.	Heinke	Oliver	Van Zandt
Cole, N. Y.	Hess	Osmers	Voorhis, Calif.
Connery	Hill	Patton	Vorys, Ohio
Corbett	Hinshaw	Pierce, N. Y.	Vreeland
Cravens	Hoffman	Pittenger	Wadsworth
Crawford	Hook	Plumley	Welch
Crowther	Hope	Powers	Wheat
Culkin	Horton	Randolph	White, Idaho
Curtis	Hull	Rankin	Wigglesworth
Dirksen	Jacobsen	Reece, Tenn.	Williams, Del.
Ditter	Jarrett	Reed, Ill.	Winter
Dondero	Jenkins, Ohio	Reed, N. Y.	Wolcott
Douglas	Jenks, N. H.	Rees, Kans.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Dowell	Jensen	Rich	Wolverton, N. J.
Dworschak	Johns	Risk	Woodruff, Mich.
Eaton	Johnson, Ill.	Robison, Ky.	Youngdahl
Eberhart	Johnson, Ind.	Rockefeller	
Elston	Jones, Ohio	Rodgers, Pa.	
Engel	Kean	Rogers, Mass.	

NOT VOTING—17

Andrews	Fernandez	Keogh	Taylor, Colo.
Barry	Holmes	Mansfield	White, Ohio
Chipfield	Jeffries	May	
Curley	Kennedy, Martin	Pfeifer	
Darrow	Kennedy, Md.	Smith, Va.	

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Taylor of Colorado with Mr. Andrews.
 Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Darrow.
 Mr. Kennedy of Maryland with Mr. Jeffries.
 Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Pfeifer.
 Mr. Keogh with Mr. Barry.
 Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Holmes.
 Mr. May with Mr. White of Ohio.
 Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Chipfield.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WHITE] has been suddenly called home by reason of serious illness in his family. If present, he would vote "no."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that my colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] is detained by illness. If he were present, he would vote "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing in the RECORD a speech made by the Speaker of the House before the Legislature of Alabama on the 24th day of August, and the introductory speech made on that occasion by the Lieutenant Governor of Alabama.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and an interview by Mr. Hartman A. Morgan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENTS ON COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I submit a unanimous-consent request which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RAYBURN asks unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the second session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, the Speaker be authorized to fill vacancies on commissions and committees authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

GENERAL PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I submit a further unanimous-consent request.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RAYBURN asks unanimous consent that all Members of the House shall have the privilege until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published, to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on more than one subject, if they so desire, and may also include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extension of remarks; but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or any speech delivered subsequent to the adjournment of Congress: *Provided*, That quotations from reports of committees of Congress shall be from such reports only as have been submitted officially and printed as documents by order of the House, by law, or pursuant to the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 326

Resolved, That FRED BRADLEY, of Michigan, be, and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The resolution was agreed to.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following resignation from committees.

The Clerk read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., November 3, 1939.

HON. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD,
 Speaker of the House of Representatives,
 Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby respectfully tender my resignation from membership on the Committee on Indian Affairs and Public Buildings and Grounds.

Very sincerely yours,

FRED BRADLEY.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include therein a quotation of one page from a bill previously introduced.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include a radio address delivered by myself on November 2 on the neutrality bill, and also excerpts from the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other associations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include an address by Miss Josephine Wilkins, delivered at Atlanta, Ga., on Facts versus Folklore, an adventure in democracy. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will run about three pages.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MAJOR DISASTERS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the indulgence of the House for this brief time to call attention of Members to a very unfortunate and ill-timed decision announced today by attorneys for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It is a decision that will adversely affect areas that will include some 30 States of this Union.

May I state at the outset that I have a profound respect for Hon. Jesse Jones who has done an outstanding job as Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I have complimented that organization in the past and have pointed with pride to its splendid record. Moreover, as a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations having jurisdiction over the R. F. C., I have steadfastly supported that organization.

But, Mr. Speaker and Members, I have a complaint—a serious complaint—to register with reference to a decision given out since noon today by attorneys for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. After much deliberation and procrastination, R. F. C. attorneys have today advised some Members of this Congress, so I am advised, that droughts are not disasters. But the same attorneys have ruled that floods do constitute a disaster.

Let me say here that I am not personally acquainted with all of the attorneys in the R. F. C. and I am not aware of the particular one who gave such a profound legal opinion. I do not know if any such attorneys ever saw a dust storm or have the slightest idea what suffering our drought-stricken farmers have endured. But I do know that such an opinion is not only unsound but utterly absurd. Frankly, I am amazed and very much chagrined that anyone calling himself a lawyer should render such a silly decision and expect those of us living in the Middle West to accept such a decision as final.

A few moments ago I entered a protest personally to my good friend, Hon. Jesse Jones, who is now in the House cloak room, against such an absurd ruling on the part of the attorneys for the R. F. C., and he expressed the desire to assist the drought-stricken area in any way possible. But under such a narrow ruling of his legal staff that would seem impossible.

Of course, if the R. F. C. attorneys had taken the time to read the discussions on this floor before they gave out such a foolish ruling they certainly could not have possibly done so. When the disaster relief appropriation was being considered in this body, and before the committees, it was made plain that it was for droughts as well as floods. Of course, we want the flood areas assisted but—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It would appear that the attorneys for the R. F. C. have never heard of the unusual drought in the Middle West. Possibly they do not know of that vast Dust Bowl area, a large portion of which has had little or no rain for months. Perhaps they do not know that in thousands of acres of wheat fields of Oklahoma wheat has not yet sprouted because of the serious drought. Maybe they do not know many other fields in Oklahoma and other States have not been planted for the reason that farmers have been unable to even plow the ground, and yet attorneys for the R. F. C. have the temerity to advise Members of this House that such a situation does not constitute a disaster.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. In order to tell the gentleman that I agree with everything that he said. I have just come back from the drought-stricken area of Nebraska, and the farmers out there will say "Amen" to what the gentleman has said.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, desiring to be strictly within the rules of the House, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short table of imports and exports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include a letter written to me in 1934 on the subject of neutrality legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial recently appearing in the Boston Herald on the National Youth Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two subsequent issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on two different subjects, and include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an address on the radio delivered by Dorothy Thompson, Ernest Lindley, Jay Franklin, and Boake Carter. The estimate is that this will run five pages.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address I delivered before the Maryland National Guard of Baltimore.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution passed by the United Rubber Workers of America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain Government statistics.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.
There was no objection.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a bill which I had intended to introduce as late as possible in this body with comments of my own on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that I have been greatly disappointed by the action of the House in the last few days on the neutrality bill, I have prepared an address entitled "After the War, Peace," as a sequel to the action of the House. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by placing this speech in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter I received from Arthur C. Jackson, of the State of Maine, also his brief statement.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement concerning the birthday of Elizabeth Cady Stanton.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article on the Fort Wayne housing program.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD with regard to certain farm prices and to include therein certain statistical tables.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 1 minute.

PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this deals with a question of the privilege of the House, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes. I will conclude in shorter time if possible.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, during my absence from the Chamber, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook] stated in substance that when I was speaking on the floor of the House on the 27th day of October—and the proceedings will be found at page 1043 of the RECORD of that date—he asked me this question: "Does not the gentleman think it is about time that even Members of Congress restrain themselves as purveyors of hate?"

The gentleman from northern Michigan [Mr. Hook], as I am advised, followed that statement today by saying in substance that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD had been changed to read "purveyors of false information." The gentleman then continued:

Is this correct procedure?

Does a Member have a right to change the form and substance of a question and the form and substance of an answer in the RECORD?

The gentleman then obtained a statement from the Speaker to the effect that such procedure would not be proper as, of course, it would not.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook] then asked that the RECORD be corrected.

I state here and now that I did not change one word in the question asked by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook] and that no statement made by me on that day in any way changes the form or the substance of the colloquy; that the RECORD as it now stands on page 1043 is correct, as is shown by the official record of the stenographer who took down in shorthand and who transcribed the words that were uttered on that day and by the official copy sent to the printer, which a few moments ago was in the possession of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook].

Under permission granted to me to extend my remarks—and I ask the attention of the House so that if any Member objects I will ask unanimous consent to withdraw the extension—I added this:

I do not know of any Member of the present Congress who ever knowingly was a purveyor of false information. I have found my colleagues to be honest, to be conscientious, and I regret that the gentleman should charge that any Member of Congress has been guilty of giving out false information. In my judgment, the charge is hastily made.

I also added this further statement:

The gentleman cannot cite a single instance where I ever knowingly gave out false information and I do not believe that he can cite a single instance where any Member of this Congress ever knowingly gave out false information.

I repeat if there is a man on the floor who wants either one of these statements withdrawn I will withdraw it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. In a few moments.

Those statements were made in defense of the integrity of the Members of the House, and to those statements I again subscribe. I do not now believe that any Member objects to either statement. If he does, let him speak.

Since the gentleman made the statement on the floor I have been advised by the Official Reporter that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook] did use the words "false information"; that he did use the words "purveyors of false information"; that he did not use the words "purveyors of hate." An examination of the original record proves the accuracy of my statement just made.

I further examined a copy of the official transcript which went to the printer, and which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook] has examined, and from that transcript it appears that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook] is in error in assuming that he used the words "purveyors of hate"; that in truth and in fact he used the words set forth in the RECORD at page 1043, "purveyors of false information."

I therefore object to the suggested change in the RECORD, which would not be a correction of the RECORD, but which, if made, would render it an inaccurate transcript of the proceedings as they occurred.

While the statement made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook] on the floor of the House today in my absence is of little, if any, concern to me personally, it does involve the integrity of the proceedings of the House; and if anyone challenges the accuracy of the statement which I have just made, I request that the Speaker of the House correct the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook], so that the RECORD of the House will state the fact.

I have no doubt but that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook] spoke inadvertently, and I am quite sure that on reflection he will agree with me that no Member of the House ever knowingly misrepresents the facts.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised, as was the gentleman from Oklahoma, at the ruling given by the attorneys for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. In making a ruling that disasters do not include droughts, I think they are overlooking the legislative history of the bill, because, if my memory serves me right, either

in the original appropriation for the Disaster Loan Corporation or in a subsequent appropriation for it, the question was asked whether or not a drought would be considered a disaster, and assurances were given by members of the committee in charge of the bill that a disaster would include a drought. I am sure that the interpretation of the gentleman from Oklahoma is fully warranted, as anyone knows that too little rain is just as much a disaster as too much of it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I do not know anything about the so-called legal opinion that has been delivered by some attorney for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, but may I say I can hardly understand how any man living in a drought district can complain on account of what the Government has done or what it has failed to do, when as much has been done for these districts as has been done through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and other agencies of the Government. Only recently \$20,000,000 has been applied to taking care of drought cases, and I understand other funds will be made available.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman does not take the same position that the attorneys for the R. F. C. take; that is, that a flood is a disaster but a drought is not?

Mr. RAYBURN. I do not take any position with reference to the question at all. However, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and other agencies of the Government have been very liberal with people in the drought areas and in the flood districts, and I do not think those people have any right to complain.

[Here the gavel fell.]

FARM RELIEF—WAR AND COMMUNISM

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

FARM RELIEF

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned of this ruling to which the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] referred. I fear it will work a great hardship on the farmers in some of the stricken areas. Some Members do not regard this disaster seriously, but I happen to know that so far as the district I represent is concerned it is the worst we have had in a hundred years. I voted against the adjournment resolution for that reason, and I believe if we had known this ruling was coming I could have induced the House to postpone adjournment until this proposition could have been acted upon, and the law so amended as to enable us to use these disaster funds to take care of the distressed farmers in the drought-stricken areas, as well as the flooded areas. They can be used in the flooded areas under the present law, regardless of this ruling.

If it had not been for the fight I have made here, I doubt if we would have got any assistance for them at all. I contended all along that these people were entitled to more consideration at our hands than are the people of Europe. This is our problem, and we must look after it. But the European conflict is not our war, and we should stay out of it.

We cannot afford to neglect our own people just because Europe has decided to stage another one of her age-old conflicts.

KEEP OUT OF EUROPEAN WAR

Owing to the limit of time, I was unable to complete my address to the House on Wednesday on the subject of keeping this country out of the European war. I, therefore, desire to finish my statement at this time.

This House is an open forum, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is about the only free press left open to us through which to take these messages uncensored to the American people, as well as to the American Congress. If a certain international element succeeds in plunging us into war, then all voices of protest may be silenced.

Therefore, since this may be my last opportunity to present my reasons why we should keep out of this war, I am taking advantage of it to present my side of the argument in terms you can all understand.

If this message helps to keep my country out of this war, then my efforts will not have been in vain. I agree with President Roosevelt's statement that we should keep out of the present European conflict.

I agree with Paul McNutt that we should resolve at all costs—short of a direct attack upon our shores—to keep America out of this war.

As I said, I am not a pacifist; and everybody who is familiar with Paul McNutt's record knows that he is not a pacifist. We are for building up our national defense, until we have an air force, a Navy, and an Army that can forever protect American shores, and defend American rights wherever and whenever we are attacked. But we are not willing to see this country dragged into the periodically recurring wars of Europe until we exhaust our manhood and our resources, and probably lose our American institutions, including our form of government—if not our Christian civilization.

We can keep out of this war; and we must keep out.

America's entrance into this conflict is being advocated by certain international financiers and munitions makers, and especially by the Communists, who have succeeded in stirring up trouble throughout the civilized world. They are determined to make trouble for us by dragging us in, if possible.

If they have not contributed largely to stirring up the present European war, they have, by their propaganda and their influence, contributed to keeping that war alive. They are determined to drag the United States into it and further pulverize the ground for communism to sweep the world when England, the United States, and Germany, the three great white nations of the earth, are exhausted, and peace again—if it may be called peace—"lies panting on the ravaged plains" of Europe.

Communism, which we all know has for its objective the destruction of our form of government, as well as our Christian civilization, has honeycombed this country, and has been financed by the highbrow Wall Street internationalists who largely control the finances of the world. If the Dies committee will continue to do its duty, it will unfold to the people of America a chapter of treachery to our Government, our industries, and our institutions that will so harrow up the souls of the Christian people of America that they will rise as one man and forever purge our Nation of these baneful influences.

This element seems to have got control of a large part of the metropolitan press. They own or control many of the large daily newspapers and magazines that are now being used as propaganda agencies to plunge this country into another devastating war.

If they do not own the large newspapers in a city, they invariably control them, through their advertising or otherwise, to such an extent that they dare not publish the whole truth as to what is going on—either as news items or in their editorial columns.

They have got control of the radio to a large extent at least, and have been drumming their alien propaganda into the ears of the helpless American people for years. They have even attempted to appropriate George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, U. S. Grant, Jefferson Davis, and Robert E. Lee and misrepresent them to the world as outstanding apostles of the things they are now attempting to perpetrate.

What would these great men think if they could arise from their graves and hear the way their names are being taken in vain, by these propagandists who are broadcasting their alien propaganda under the guise of democracy, or preaching a

false Americanism in broken English, and with distorted logic?

They are becoming a little more adroit now, and are using stooges who can speak perfect English to broadcast their propaganda.

It used to be that an American home could protect itself against outside vices, and a dispenser of evil dared not enter to corrupt the lives of its children; but today they come through the radio under the guise of advertising the sale of some article, gasoline, coffee, boots, or even bibles, and drum into the ears of the innocent children of America their alien ideologies, as well as their war propaganda.

If we are to protect our country, our homes, and our children, we are going to have to have an American radio, as well as an American press, and American movies, along with our American flag.

They have got control of the picture shows through which they rake down enormous salaries, many of which are 2, 3, 5, or even 10 times the salary of the President of the United States.

They are using the movies as a powerful weapon to push their alien doctrines and war propaganda, to undermine American morals, and to destroy everything for which our forefathers fought and bled.

In their vicious attempt to destroy representative government they even went so far recently as to give to the world a picture called, *Mr. Smith Goes to Washington*. It was the most pernicious and exaggerated attack ever made on the United States Senate. They pictured "Jefferson Smith," the newly appointed Senator, as standing alone against vice and corruption, while every other Senator was pictured as tucking his tail and running out, like a whipped cur. They did that in order to bring the Senate into disrepute, and to show that body the power of this alien influence to mold or control public sentiment in America, and to stir up strife among the American people. They selected a rare example of a senatorial tool of predatory interests, of former days, and held him up to the world as representing every single Member of the United States Senate, except the synthetic Senator, of their own manufacture, Mr. Jefferson Smith, who had just arrived.

They were all out of step but Jeff.

I wonder if this picture was intentionally designed to try to affect the Senate's vote on pending measures or on a probable declaration of war, or if it was just a part of the Communists' program directed from Moscow to overthrow representative government in the United States.

Through their nefarious system of block booking, by which they squeeze out the independent picture houses and compel their regular customers to accept every picture they offer, no matter how nauseating it may be, they have created a system of propaganda the like of which this country has never seen.

They are using it to spread their alien doctrines, undermine American institutions, corrupt the youth of the land, and build up a war psychology to try to drag America into this European conflict, which would likely cost the lives of millions of our young men, wipe out our form of government, and probably destroy the last vestige of our Christian civilization.

These communistic elements, aided, abetted, and financed by certain rich Shylocks in Wall Street, are stirring up all the trouble they can between the whites and the Negroes, especially in the South, knowing that the poor Negroes will be the sufferers in the end. But what do they care how much trouble they cause the people of the South, so long as it aids their cause.

They are behind this so-called antilynching bill and have been pushing it for years for nothing in God's world but to stir up trouble between the white people and the Negroes in the Southern States. I am speaking by the cards now, for I have heard every speech they have made in the House and every false and vicious attack they have waged against the white people of the South in those speeches since the opening day of the Sixty-seventh Congress.

There is a petition before the House now to take this bill away from the committee in order to force it through at the coming session.

In that bill they exempt all the gangsters and racketeers; it does not apply to them. It is a base subterfuge, designed to stir up race trouble in the South. It is carrying out the Communist program to stir strife and keep it going. It is not even designed to prevent lynching.

They are now carrying this propaganda through the picture shows, and mixing whites and Negroes in their pictures, which they know does not represent the normal life of the American people in any State in this Union, much less in the South. They have set in to destroy the separate schools in the Southern States, to change our election laws, and to break down the laws preventing intermarriage between the races. They want to force Negro equality on the South and to mongrelize America, so they can get complete control of it, as they thought they had done in certain South American countries. They are stirring the deepest resentment among the old-line Americans this country has ever seen.

These international Communists created Hitler; they created Mussolini, and Franco, and Stalin, and all the other ideological dictators of Europe.

They created Stalin through communism in Russia, which is the nihilism of another century brought down to date and made more vicious by modern methods. Russian communism has murdered 20,000,000 people in Russia since the close of the World War. In one year they took the grain and livestock, and everything else necessary to sustain life, away from the white farmers in the Ukraine and starved more than a million of them to death. Some writers contend they starved 3,000,000. These were white Christian citizens of Soviet Russia, where their people had lived for centuries. They were industrious farmers who had made abundant crops; but Godless communism robbed them of the products of their soil and their toil and forced upon them the most ignominious death to which suffering humanity could be subjected. Dante, by the wildest stretch of his imagination, could not have created a more terrible inferno than that of a million honest, industrious men, women, and children, starving to death in their own homes after an abundant harvest for which, in America, they could have enjoyed at least one glorious Thanksgiving.

I think I can see now the homes of those Russian farmers. I see in those humble cottages the Nordic faces of men, women, and children. I see them look with gladdened eyes as they all toil to pack their barns with an abundant harvest. I see the bearded Communist, the father of the sit-down strike in America, come with his wagons or his trucks and haul it away. I see the ashen faces of the Ukrainian farmers as they stare helplessly in the presence of their weeping wives and children. I see them shivering in the chilling blasts of winter as the inescapable menace of hunger gradually closes in until these children die with outstretched hands, while fainting fathers utter their expiring prayers of protests, and starving mothers give their withered breasts to dying babes.

That is what communism brought to Russia and what it has tried to bring, and is still trying to bring, to the people of America. How would you like to see them duplicate that picture in Mississippi, Ohio, Kansas, Nebraska, and every other agricultural State?

A friend of mine, a Member of Congress, was in Italy a few years ago, and he asked an Italian businessman why those people stood for the dictatorship of Mussolini. His answer was, "For self-protection." He said, "We do not like Mussolini or his policies any better than you do. We love democracy, we wanted representative government to continue, but we found it impossible under existing conditions." He said, "Communism invaded Italy, and organized the riff-raff to where it was an unsafe place for decent, law-abiding people to live. They were bringing about chaos. They would go into a man's place of business, help themselves to his goods, and walk out without paying a cent, and probably knock him in the head even if he protested. They would go into a restaurant, or a hotel, sit down and eat, and walk out without

paying a cent, and beat up the waiters or proprietors if they tried to collect. They would invade private homes and rob, rape, or murder the inmates, and if a policeman interfered they would gang and murder him." He said, "It was either Mussolini or chaos, and as much as we detest dictatorships, we chose Mussolini as the least of the two evils. We hope some day to get back to representative government."

After the World War, the Versailles conference discarded Wilson's 14 points and imposed peace conditions which everyone predicted would bring another European war. After a revolution or two, the German people set up a democratic government and tried to work their way out of a bad situation. Hitler was an obscure artist, whose name had never been heard outside of his immediate locality. The Communists flocked in to take charge of Germany. They put on the wildest monetary inflation Europe has ever seen. An American dollar, a French dollar, or an English dollar would buy so much German money that you could hardly haul it home in a one-horse wagon.

These internationalists—and I am quoting from a Member of this Congress who was there at the time—flocked into Germany by the hundreds of thousands, more than 50,000 of them coming from Russia alone. They brought foreign moneys with them and bought up the properties of the bankrupt Germans for a song, and then filled the places of honor, trust, responsibility, or remuneration with their own people, attempted to sovietize the country and grind the German people into the dust of subjugation. That is what created Hitler and the present Nazi regime in Germany. Will we now permit them to duplicate that disaster and create a Hitler for us in America?

God forbid!

I want it understood that I have no brief for Hitler, or for any other dictator or dictatorship. They are opposed to everything for which I stand. Nor have I ever belonged to any organization that had for its motive racial or religious prejudice or persecution. I am not a member of the Brown Shirts, the Black Shirts, or the Silver Shirts. I wear a common white cotton shirt, made in Mississippi. I am an American.

I regard nazi-ism, or fascism, and communism as merely different symptoms of the same disease—a form of international malaria. One of them is the chill and the other is the fever of the dying liberties of mankind.

But I am telling you what these international agitators and communists have brought upon the people of other countries and what their course of conduct would ultimately bring to America, and that is class bitterness and racial hatred from which their people would be the chief sufferers, and which would probably result in the destruction of our constitutional government, to be followed by the most consummate dictatorship the western world has ever known—after they had dragged us through another European war.

From the beginning, these elements have been in collusion with Moscow to overthrow the American Republic. If the members of the Dies committee will go through with their investigation to the end they will find that this movement has been financed by the smug international agitators in Wall Street who got rich out of the World War and who are now financing the propaganda to get us into the present European conflict—thinking that if they can keep it going long enough England, Germany, and the United States will become exhausted and they can then take charge and dominate the world.

They are undermining every phase of American life. They have invariably disrupted industry and paralyzed commerce, and have all but wrecked American labor, and at the same time they have penalized the American farmers and prevented recovery from a depression from which we should have emerged 6, 8, or 10 years ago.

They inaugurated the sit-down strike, the old weapon of nihilism, and have attempted in every possible way to prevent a settlement of these strikes and to destroy American industries. The scheme was to bring on a crash that would throw the country into communism.

Thank God, Paul McNutt, as Governor of Indiana, had the courage to kick these sit-down strikes out of his State and save both labor and industry from their disastrous consequences. I wish we could have had 47 more such Governors in the other States.

They have betrayed President Roosevelt; they have betrayed his administration; they have betrayed the Democratic Party; they have betrayed America.

They have attempted to honeycomb this Government and plant Communists in key positions. According to the report of the Dies committee, many of the names of this Communist-front organization published by the committee as being on the Federal pay roll are international Communist agitators.

Are we going to leave these international Communists, members of an organization sworn to overthrow this Government, striving to destroy Christianity, working to wipe out this Anglo-Saxon civilization that you and I enjoy—are we going to leave them in these key positions and permit them to sabotage this Government and wreck the industries of this country in case they succeed in dragging us into a war? They may create an incident in the bombing of a ship, or the blowing up of a factory, or the commission of some other horrible crime that they can lay at the door of a foreign power, in order to drag us into the war, and then complete the wreck of this great Republic, created by Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Franklin, and which has afforded us the most glorious example of liberty, freedom, and self-government the world has ever known.

Some of them would dynamite the Capitol or blow up the White House to get us into this war.

When they first started trying to get us into this war, their beloved Russia was going to be on our side. The Russian Ambassador, Troyanovsky, alias Finkelstein, was here conspiring with these Communists and openly advocating a military alliance between Soviet Russia and the United States.

Thank God, that scheme failed.

There are more than 100 of us ex-service men in this House now, and if these people succeed in plunging this country into a war, we are going to see to it that they do not escape military service; that they do not remain at home to wreck our Government and get rich out of it. Not only that, but we are going to see that no "dollar a year" men come out of this war as multimillionaires. And while we are at it, we are going to tax not only the profits of this war but of the last war as well.

They are not going to plunge America into a holocaust of destruction and then escape all the consequences to reap enormous fortunes and then take charge of American institutions when the war is over and the country exhausted.

We are going to save America for Americans.

In addition to honeycombing our Government, they are trying to make a farce out of the civil service and a mockery out of our immigration laws. They have distributed copies of former civil-service questions and coached each other to where they crowd the civil-service register, and promote each other in the Government service until practically every bureau is rankling with resentment and seething with discontent.

They are flocking into this country by the thousands in flagrant violation of our immigration laws, crowding Americans out of their jobs, and adding to and intensifying the race troubles we already have.

Mr. Speaker, I am not criticizing any man for his vote on lifting the arms embargo. Members of the House have been subjected to such pressure as I have never seen brought to bear in all the years of my services in this House. I take it that everyone voted for what he thought was the best way to keep America out of this war. That is what I did, and I have no apologies for it.

But the battle has just begun; the next vote is the one to worry about. If we are to keep America out of this war, I fear we are confronted by a fight that will test the souls of men. We Members who voted on the different sides of this embargo question, and who were imbued with the sole idea and actuated by the sole purpose of keeping our country out

of this war, will be fighting shoulder to shoulder within the next few months against this organized, world-wide influence that will be turning heaven and earth to get us in.

I heard an old Confederate soldier say that General Forrest once said he "would not give a damn for any soldier who went into battle expecting to come out alive." No man who is not willing to take his political or his physical life in his hands to protect his country in a crisis like that which we are likely approaching is worthy to occupy a seat in this House, because if we yield to the pressure of these international influences we will probably pay for it with the blood of our people, with the lives of millions of our young men, and with the fate of our country itself.

As Shakespeare says,

Better be with the dead,
Whom we, to gain our place, have sent to peace,
Than on the torture of the mind to lie
In restless ecstasy.

My life or your life, physically or politically, means little or nothing compared to the lives and destinies of the 130,000,000 people whom you and I are sent here to represent.

If we were to consult those 130,000,000 people and give them all a chance to speak, they would thunder back almost with the voice of unanimity, "Keep America out of this war."

If Washington, if Jefferson, if Lincoln, if Davis, if Grant, if Lee—if all our great statesmen and patriots of former generations could press back the veil that hides us from that mysterious realm where they have taken their places "in the silent halls of death" and speak a word of warning to the American people that would echo throughout the "illimitable void of space" until it drowned all other sounds to silence, their unanimous admonition would be—as it has always been—"Keep America out of European wars."

If Woodrow Wilson, after being disillusioned as he was by his bitter experiences with the hatreds, the animosities, the intrigues, the duplicities, and the ingratitude of Europe, could peer through the eternal mists and utter one word of fatherly advice to the people of this country, that word would be to, "Keep America out of this war."

If the gray-haired fathers and mothers who gave their sons in the last war, including the ones who have sunk in heart-broken silence to untimely graves, could make their voices heard, they would appeal to every Member of Congress to, "Keep America out of this war."

If the voiceless thousands of our patriotic dead who went down in the last war, including the Unknown Soldier who sleeps in Arlington's sacred tomb, could "wipe the grave dust from their palled brows" and come forth "in tattered robes of bony whiteness" to utter one word in the cause of their country, for which they died, it would be an appeal to, "Keep America out of this war."

God give us the wisdom to see the right and the courage to do our duty when we see it, that we may hold aloft the American flag and perpetuate American institutions to bless the coming generations as they have blessed our own. May the spirits of the immortal founders of this Republic guide and sustain us during the trying months that lie ahead. And may we, the recipients of American liberty—that proud heritage of patriotism, conceived in the minds of the greatest statesmen the world has ever produced, guarded and protected by the undying loyalty of a noble ancestry—may we forever preserve and defend that liberty in our time and transmit it unimpaired to our posterity, that this grand old Republic may go down to the future with strength in her loins, hope in her soul, and the Miriam song of triumph on her lips. [Applause.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIROVICH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, it takes a lifetime for a man to build up an honorable character. It takes but a moment to destroy it.

A few minutes ago I heard the reputation of the general counsel of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation bitterly assailed. I happened to have studied the workings of the distinguished, brilliant, and eminent general counsel of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Claude Hamilton, Jr. He is one of the most indefatigable and persevering workers, one of the most assiduous and persistent caretakers of the rights of the people of our Nation, and one of the most indomitable public servants in the service of the Government of the United States.

He is a disciple of the present Justice of Supreme Court Hugo Black. He has endeared himself to all who have come into intimate contact with him for his gentlemanliness, for his kindness, and for his humanitarian services. While I do not desire to subtract anything that the previous speakers might have said about the drought, I am sure if they would contact this genial and able general counsel of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation he will do everything that is compatible with law and dignity to serve the cause that they represent. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

THE ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the record roll call vote of the Members who voted to adjourn a few moments ago, like Banquo's ghost, will never die. It will rise to haunt many Members who voted to adjourn, not only those from the drought-suffering districts but those from many other districts. In view of the many important distressing and perplexing problems, domestic and foreign, which confront our country and our countrymen, the Congress should remain in session and help in their solution.

With reference to the complaint that was made after the sine die adjournment resolution was agreed to, I believe that if the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] had voted against the resolution to adjourn so that this Congress could remedy the situation about which he complained, he would have been rendering far better service to the drought-afflicted areas of America. Action by Congress and not mere vocal protests after adjournment on drought relief and many other important problems is what the people want and are entitled to receive. Voting to adjourn and then protesting about administrative ills which Congress should and can cure reminds me of locking the barn door after the horse has been stolen. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 306. Joint resolution to preserve the neutrality and the peace of the United States and to secure the safety of its citizens and their interests.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President for his approval a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 306. Joint resolution to preserve the neutrality and the peace of the United States and to secure the safety of its citizens and their interests.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States announced that on the following date he approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

On October 11, 1939:

H. J. Res. 384. Joint resolution to make provision for certain expenses incident to the second session of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a communication from the President of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, November 3, 1939.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As it seems probable that this extraordinary session of the Congress will be brought to adjournment within a few hours, may I extend through you to the Members of the House of Representatives my congratulations and good wishes.

I hope that world events will not make it necessary to have any other extraordinary session—and, therefore, in anticipation of seeing you all on the 3d of January next, I extend to you in the meantime my best wishes for a happy Thanksgiving and a merry Christmas. May I add that I hope those Members from States whose Governors have set November 30 as Thanksgiving Day will celebrate both Thanksgivings—the 23d and the 30th.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The Honorable, THE SPEAKER,
The House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 31, the Chair declares the extraordinary session of the Seventy-sixth Congress adjourned sine die.

Thereupon (at 6 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned sine die.

APPROVAL OF A HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to the final adjournment of the second session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, notified the Clerk of the House of Representatives that he had approved a joint resolution of the House, as follows:
On November 4, 1939:

H. J. Res. 306. Joint resolution to preserve the neutrality and the peace of the United States and to secure the safety of its citizens and their interests.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1111. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the quartermaster general, United Spanish War Veterans, transmitting the proceedings of the stated convention of the Forty-first Encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans, held in Atlantic City, N. J., September 10-14, 1939 (H. Doc. No. 498), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. BLOOM: Committee of conference. H. J. Res. 306. Joint Resolution, Neutrality Act of 1939 (Rept. No. 1475). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. WARREN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 304. Resolution for the relief of Alice Everett Cox; without amendment (Rept. No. 1474). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

LXXXV—89

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska:

H. R. 7616. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish additional statistical information and marketing service for the benefit of the poultry industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 7617. A bill to authorize the acquisition of forest lands adjacent to and over which highways, roads, or trails are constructed or to be constructed wholly or partially with Federal funds in order to preserve or restore their natural beauty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHIFFLER:

H. R. 7618. A bill to authorize the acquisition of lands for cemetery purposes in the vicinity of Grafton, W. Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 7619. A bill to set aside certain lands for Bear Butte National Monument and to authorize their administration as such; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 7620. A bill providing for the promotion of employees in the Customs field service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATRICK:

H. R. 7621. A bill providing for disposal of public lands in certain cases; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 7622. A bill to provide for loans to farmers for soil conservation purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 7623. A bill to establish a cotton research award fund; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEFAN:

H. R. 7624. A bill to forbid the importation of certain agricultural products into the United States from foreign countries until the comparable domestic article attains the parity price; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLAYPOOL:

H. R. 7625. A bill for the relief of Bert and Marie Freeman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York:

H. R. 7626. A bill for the relief of Ernest Unger; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 7627. A bill extending the provisions of the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes,' approved May 22, 1920, and acts in amendment thereof" to A. V. Taggart; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H. R. 7628. A bill for the relief of William H. Linhart; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5857. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of Hugh Sheehan, of Portland, Oreg., and others, asking for the retention of the embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5858. By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of 1,800 members of the Council of Women Opposed to Participation in Foreign Wars, of Newark and Licking County, Ohio, protesting against the taking of any step whatsoever on the part of our Government which would tend to send American sons to another war on foreign soil; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5859. By Mr. DONDERO: Petition of citizens of Pontiac, Mich., urging that the good offices of our Government be employed at the earliest opportune time to secure, through collaboration with other neutral states, a truce between the nations now at war, wherein they may find by peaceful negotiation and discussion a way to compose their differences and solve their problems; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5860. By Mr. GIFFORD: Petition of James B. Conant, president of Harvard College, and others; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5861. By Mr. HART: Petition of Newark Post, No. 10, American Legion, urging that immediate action be taken to enact Senate bill 2711, prohibiting employment within the United States of aliens by manufacturers of aircraft, aircraft

engines, and accessories for the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5862. By Mr. SHEPPARD: Petition of the Long Beach Democratic Club, Long Beach, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5863. By Mr. WEAVER: Petition of R. C. McBride, of Waynesville, Haywood County, N. C., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5864. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. H. Boy Frankel, of Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of the resolution with reference to the neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.